

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 547—82nd Congress

Chapter 758—2nd Session

H. R. 8370

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 547	1
Index and Summary of H. R. 8370.	2

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 547

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1953; Includes funds for the Mexican farm labor program of the Labor Department, water conservation and utilization projects of SCS (\$190,000), research in utilization of saline water through the Interior Department, Tennessee Valley Authority, flood control by the Army Corps of Engineers, government in occupied areas (Title II), foreign aid (Title III, the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1953, including items for economic and technical assistance) Office of Defense Mobilization, Defense Production Administration, Defense Transport Administration, defense production activities of USDA (\$2,000,000), Economic Stabilization Agency, Federal Civil Defense Administration and payment of claims and judgments against the U. S.

Includes general provisions as follows: Continues, at \$1,400 each, the limitation on the amount that may be spent for purchase of passenger motor vehicles, notwithstanding the provision in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953. Continues the language restricting the employment of aliens, relating to living quarters allowances, prohibiting the filling of positions by anyone whose nomination has been disapproved by the Senate, limiting the amount that may be paid for copies of the U. S. Code Annotated, relating to the use of funds by Government corporations, prohibiting the use of funds of corporations for purchase or construction of office buildings at the seat of Government, prohibiting strikes of Government employees against the Government, concerning payments to retired officers who may be conducting negotiations with the Government, and authorizing the transfer of personnel and appropriations to defense activities of various departments and agencies of the Government pursuant to law. Continues, and makes permanent, language previously carried authorizing the use of appropriated funds for payment of taxes where the U. S. is an employer as defined by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950. Prohibits the use of funds in this Act to pay employees at rates in excess of those provided in the regular 1953 appropriation acts. Provides that during the fiscal year the provisions of Budget Bureau Circular A-45, relating to rental of Government-owned living quarters, shall be controlling over all departments and agencies; that the Circular may be changed by the Budget Bureau only with the approval of the Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations; that the Budget Bureau shall report to Congress on this matter by January 31, 1953; and that no officer or employee shall be required to occupy any Government-owned quarters unless necessary. Validates obligations incurred by the departments and agencies whose regular appropriation bills had not been approved by July 1, 1952.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 8370

May 12, 1952 Hearings: House, Part I

June 12, 1952 Hearings: House, Part II

June 16, 1952 Hearings: House, Part III

June 24, 1952 Hearings: House, Part IV

June 26, 1952 Mr. Cannon from the Committee on Appropriations reported H. R. 8370. (House Report 2316) Print of bill as reported.

June 27, 1952 House began debate

June 28, 1952 House concluded debate and passed with amendments, H. R. 8370. (Bill as passed the House was not printed).

Agreed to the following amendments:

By Rep. Whitten, to prohibit use of foreign-aid funds "for the purchase of agricultural products or products produced from agricultural products not declared to be in short supply in the United States by the Secretary of Agriculture at less than the prevailing market price for such commodity within the United States or, if obtained from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, at less than the support price of such commodity including handling and storage costs". Before action on this amendment, a similar provision in the bill had been stricken on a point of order raised by Rep. Gary.

By Rep. Whitten, to add an item of \$57,130,000 for the Economic Stabilization Agency.

By Rep. Davis, Ga., to reduce economic and technical assistance for Asia and the Pacific from \$118,634,250 to \$67,793,000; by a 124-114 vote.

By Rep. Williams, Miss., to cut the item for multilateral technical cooperation from \$15,708,750 to \$9,171,333; by a 112-96 vote.

By Rep. Keating, to reduce the funds for administrative expenses of foreign aid from \$42,000,000 to \$37,800,000; by a 101-72 vote.

By Rep. Jensen, to limit the filling of personnel vacancies in connection with foreign aid.

Rejected an amendment by Rep. Barrett to appropriate \$16,500,000 additional for the school-lunch program, by a 64-96 vote.

June 30, 1952	H. R. 8370 referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Print of the bill as referred.
July 2, 1952	Committee on Appropriations reported H. R. 8370 with amendments. (S. Report 2076). Print of the bill as reported by the Senate Committee.
July 3, 1952	Discussed and passed in the Senate, with amendments. Print of H. R. 8370 with amendments of the Senate numbered. Senate conferees appointed.
July 4, 1952	House conferees appointed
July 5, 1952	House agreed to conference report. (H. Report 2494).
July 6, 1952	Both Houses agreed to conference report. Later, the Senate rejected a House provision and returned it to conference.
July 7, 1952	Both House agreed to second conference report. (H. Report 2499).
July 15, 1952	Approved: Public Law 547, 82nd Congress

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

JUNE 26, 1952.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8370]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations to supply certain supplemental and deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The estimates upon which the bill is based are contained in House Document Nos. 285, 377, 450, 451, 452, 455, 456, 460, 461, 466, 467, 470, 476, 485, 486, 487, 488, 492, 495, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 509, 510, 511, 512, 517, 518 and 521 and Senate Document No. 144. The bill is divided into chapters corresponding to the subcommittees considering the estimates. The recommendations contained in the bill are a result of deliberations of the several subcommittees as approved by the full committee.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Budget estimates considered by the committee total \$13,750,796,030. Appropriations recommended total \$10,283,133,780, a reduction of \$3,467,662,250. These amounts are distributed by chapters of the bill as indicated in the following table:

Chapter	Agency	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
I	District of Columbia.....	\$1, 719, 416	\$915, 366	—\$804, 050
II	Legislative.....	203, 950	203, 950	-----
III	Commerce.....	716, 536	716, 536	-----
IV	Treasury, RFC.....	15, 625, 000	10, 200, 000	—5, 425, 000
V	Labor-Federal Security.....	110, 710, 400	11, 037, 750	—99, 672, 650
VI	Interior.....	525, 000	525, 000	-----
VII	Independent Offices.....	3, 434, 986, 000	1, 708, 430, 000	—1, 726, 556, 000
VIII	Defense.....	2, 993, 868, 440	2, 187, 899, 840	—805, 968, 600
IX	Mutual Security.....	6, 526, 060, 750	6, 275, 940, 750	—250, 120, 000
X	Emergency agencies.....	661, 610, 000	81, 690, 000	—579, 920, 000
XI	Claims and judgments.....	6, 489, 954	6, 489, 954	-----
	Total.....	13, 750, 796, 030	10, 283, 133, 780	—3, 467, 662, 250

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOE B. BATES, Kentucky, *Chairman*

SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts

LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon
EARL WILSON, Indiana

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Reorganization expenses.—The committee disapproves the entire amount of the budget request, \$100,000, for lack of adequate and substantial justification. The justifications presented indicated that the amount of the request was required for “contingencies which may arise in connection with reorganization—which must be provided for in order that there may not arise situations requiring appropriations but for which no funds are available”. This would indicate that a wide variety of purposes existed. However, the estimates of obligation indicate that the entire amount is to be expended for personal services. Furthermore, testimony disclosed that the funds requested would be used, at least in part, to analyze the pending reorganization plan to determine what savings, if any, will accrue from its actual operation. Testimony indicated that no dollar figures had presently been attached to the reorganization. The committee strongly feels that analysis of the effects of an administrative reorganization should precede its presentation, and that the request made at this time is comparable to the horse following the cart. Since the reorganization plan is now before the Congress, and presumably will soon become effective, the actual adjustments of administrative organization should normally occur within the appropriations available without the necessity of further imponderables.

FISCAL SERVICE

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends \$70,000, the full amount of the budget estimate. This amount represents approved repayments of erroneous collections of various taxes. The committee was disturbed to learn that the amount of refunds now pending exceeds the estimate. This tends to indicate that the estimates were prepared without benefit of all known or readily apparent information.

COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT FUND EXPENSES

District Government Retirement and Relief Funds, 1952.—The committee received a supplemental estimate of \$113,000, as set forth in House Document No. 502, and recommended that the Senate take up the item in connection with the Urgent Deficiency bill then pending in that body, which was done. The increase was immediately necessary to make payments to retired police and fire personnel and for medical care cases. An amount was also included to make effective an increase in the pension rate roughly comparable to the increase granted pursuant to Public Law 207, Eighty-second Congress, to active duty personnel. It is understood that this increase in pension rate will be effective as of about June 7, 1952.

The committee is amazed at the apparent lack of reasonable judgment on the part of responsible officials in deferring to this late date the presentation of a deficiency request the necessity for which must

have been obvious from the obligation data of the first two fiscal quarters.

District Government Retirement and Relief Funds, 1953.—An estimate of \$397,000, set forth in House Document 502, was based on the same general requirements as noted above in connection with the 1952 request, and the committee accordingly recommends appropriation of the full amount requested.

DISTRICT DEBT SERVICE

The full amount of the budget estimate, \$54,692, is recommended. This represents payment to the Treasurer of the United States, in reimbursement to that Department of an amount paid to the Pan American Union pursuant to Public Law 902, Eighty-first Congress. The amount had been collected by the District of Columbia as an inheritance tax on a bequest to the Pan American Union, and its return is authorized by the law noted above.

REGULATORY AGENCIES

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

Salaries and expenses.—The committee considered an estimate for this activity, in the amount of \$188,750, as set forth in House Document No. 502. In recommending an appropriation of \$125,000, the committee is presuming that extension of legislative authority will be forthcoming.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OPERATING EXPENSES

Public school food services fund.—In recommending the full amount of the budget estimate, \$25,000, the committee recognizes the necessity for the establishment of an initial working capital fund to carry out the purposes of Public Law 159, Eighty-second Congress. This law provides for a centrally administered system of public school cafeterias, lunchrooms, and like services. It is estimated that the annual expenditures of this operation will be \$1 million, and the \$25,000 provided is a minimum capital fund to get the program started.

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends an appropriation of \$100,000 for this item, a reduction of \$625,000 from the budget estimates.

It was testified that the essence of an effective civil defense program is an active core of paid personnel and a host of interested local volunteers. It was also testified that currently public interest is not as great as might be desired, and further that increased appropriations would secure the desired increase in public interest. The justification statement concluded with the threat that "it can be classed as criminal negligence to ignore it (any chance of attack) to the extent of withholding the funds * * *".

This committee is firmly opposed to the concept that freely flowing moneys from governmental treasuries can produce enlightenment for the general public. Further, the committee is convinced that the hysteria-producing publicity attendant upon appropriation requests

in these nerve straining days causes more potential panic damage than it produces interested awareness of danger.

In making its recommendation, the committee does not intend to minimize what is a very real threat to the well-being of all citizens. The funds that are provided are intended to do that very thing which was described as the essence of the program, namely, assure a small staff, which, doggedly devoted to its purpose, can accomplish much good in creating fundamental public awareness.

REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The budget estimate of \$5,020 is recommended for this activity, to permit the payment of per diem to the members of the Agency in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 2, 1945 (60 Stat. 793). These amounts are due and payable for prior fiscal years as well as for fiscal year 1952; payment has not been made because of various administrative rulings and an adverse ruling of the Comptroller General in regard to the use of the funds of a specific year to pay prior years obligations.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Medical charities.—In recommending \$92,613, the amount of the budget estimate, the committee wishes to point out that there is no contractual or legal basis for claiming this amount. A moral obligation undoubtedly exists. Hospitals which have contracted to care for indigent patients are fully informed that no deficiency can be incurred beyond the amount of the contract. However, the hospitals have handled cases beyond the contract provision, and, since in-patients are emergency cases, the Congress has in the past recognized these claims and granted additional appropriations.

The committee would like to point out that recent sessions of the Congress have appropriated the amounts requested for this item in regular annual bills, and in one case appropriated an amount in excess of the estimate, recognizing that the present situation arises all too frequently. The District Commissioners would do well to review their budgetary techniques with regard to this item and raise their sights more in line with reality when annual budget estimates are being prepared.

The committee insists that the practice of seeking deficiency appropriations, for fiscal years long since completed, cease and will expect the Commissioners henceforth to present a more realistic annual budget estimate.

PUBLIC WORKS

Operating expenses, electrical division.—The committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate, \$19,341, which represents a deficiency occasioned by an increase in the rates for street lighting effective April 15, 1951.

Repairs to Old Bay Line pier.—An appropriation of \$26,700 is recommended, a decrease of \$15,300 from the estimate. The basis for the estimate was given as governmental responsibility over and above the normal maintenance and repair. The contract with the lessee provides that he shall make all normal maintenance and repairs.

The committee is of the opinion that the work required can be substantially accomplished with the funds provided, and wishes to warn against overambitious maintenance programs in view of the generally debilitated condition of the pier.

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION			
460	Reorganization expenses.....	\$100, 000	-----	—\$100, 000
	FISCAL SERVICE			
460	Salaries and expenses, 1952.....	70, 000	\$70, 000	-----
	COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT FUND EXPENSES			
502	District government retirement and relief funds.....	397, 000	397, 000	-----
460	District Debt Service, 1952.....	54, 692	54, 692	-----
	REGULATORY AGENCIES			
	OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL			
502	Salaries and expenses.....	188, 750	125, 000	—63, 750
	PUBLIC SCHOOLS			
460	Operating expenses, Public School Food Services Fund.....	25, 000	25, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE			
460	Salaries and expenses.....	725, 000	100, 000	—625, 000

460	REDEVELOPMENT LAND Agency, 1952 and prior-----	5, 020	5, 020	-----
460	HEALTH DEPARTMENT Medical charities, 1950-----	92, 613	92, 613	-----
460	PUBLIC WORKS Operating expenses, electrical division, 1951-----	19, 341	19, 341	-----
460	Repairs to Old Bay Line pier-----	42, 000	26, 700	— 15, 300
	Total, chapter I-----	1, 719, 416	915, 366	— 804, 050

CHAPTER II
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SUBCOMMITTEE

CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH, New York, *Chairman*

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama

WALT HORAN, Washington
FRED E. BUSBEY, Illinois

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The bill includes \$132,200 for the House of Representatives stationery revolving fund in order to provide for the unanticipated increase in expenses borne by this fund, together with a sum to initiate a stationery allowance for a newly-elected Member; and \$71,750 for the House Office Buildings, including structural and mechanical changes.

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES			
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE			
518	Stationery (revolving fund), 1952-----	\$132, 200	\$132, 200	-----
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL			
521	House Office Buildings-----	71, 750	71, 750	-----
	Total, Chapter II-----	203, 950	203, 950	-----

CHAPTER III
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN J. ROONEY, New York, *Chairman*

DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
PRINCE H. PRESTON, Georgia
FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota

CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio
FRED G. AANDAHL, North Dakota

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Claims, Federal Airport Act.—There is included in the bill the sum of \$585,536, the amount of the budget estimate, to provide for the payment of claims for 6 public airports as certified by the Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration under the authority contained in section 17 of the Federal Airport Act of 1946 as amended. To date, appropriations totaling \$5,974,288 have been made for nine groups of claims covering 75 airports. The committee was advised that the Civil Aeronautics Administration expects to complete the processing of the 15 remaining claims at an early date.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Emergency Facilities, Radiation Physics Laboratory.—The committee recommends \$131,000, the amount of the budget estimates, to construct a Radium Laboratory and an annex to the Betatron Building. The Radium Laboratory is required to isolate in a separate building the work in connection with the handling and measurement of large quantities of radioactive materials and to insure the safety of personnel and property. The annex to the Betatron Building, for which \$63,000 is provided, is required to construct a small but heavy concrete wing in the Betatron Building so as to permit the continuous and simultaneous operation of two high-energy machines.

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimate	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimate
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION			
452	Claims, Federal Airport Act-----	\$585, 536	\$585, 536	-----
	NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS			
452	Emergency facilities, radiation physics laboratory-----	131, 000	131, 000	-----
	Total, Chapter III-----	716, 536	716, 536	-----

CHAPTER IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

SUBCOMMITTEE

J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia, *Chairman*

ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico

OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana

ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, New Jersey

GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey

EARL WILSON, Indiana

BENJAMIN F. JAMES, Pennsylvania

U. S. COAST GUARD

Operating expenses.—The committee considered a supplemental estimate of \$5,900,000 for increased pay and allowances based on rates established by Public Law 346, 82nd Congress. Based on recent payrolls, maximum requirements would be about \$5,700,000. Testimony disclosed that \$900,000 cost in 1952 had been absorbed, and it would seem eminently reasonable that at least \$100,000 per month could be absorbed in 1953. The committee, therefore, recommends an appropriation of \$4,500,000, a reduction of \$1,400,000 in the estimate.

Acquisition, construction, and improvement.—The committee considered a supplemental request in the amount of \$9,000,000, as contained in House Document No. 450.

In recommending the appropriation of \$5,000,000, a reduction of \$4,000,000 in the estimates, the committee does in no wise intend to minimize the importance of the port security program. However, the committee did feel that certain of the items in the presentation were not adequately supported, and further, that the problem of construction lead time might prove more serious than was forecast.

The amount recommended will permit of proceeding with the program to the equivalent of one half, and will allow the committee to re-examine the proposal at the start of the next session of the Congress.

Retired pay.—The committee recommendation of \$600,000 is a reduction of \$25,000 in the estimate which is required to meet increased pay authorized by Public Law 346, 82nd Congress.

Reserve Training.—The committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate, \$100,000, which is based on increased pay and allowances resulting from passage of Public Law 346, 82nd Congress.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The committee considered the regular annual operating budget of the Corporation at this time. Hearing of the estimates had been delayed so as to permit the new Administrator to become familiar with his organization.

During the interim since presentation of the President's Budget, the requirements of the Corporation were reevaluated with a reduction of \$1,650,000, as set forth in House Document No. 461. Thus the net total estimate considered by the committee was \$16,850,000.

It should be pointed out that the budget of the corporation is a limitation on the amounts of corporate funds that can be used for administrative expenses, and is not a charge against the general revenues of the Treasury.

The committee recommends that the limitation be established at \$15,500,000, a reduction of \$1,350,000 in the estimates. This decrease is predicated largely on the continuing decline in the lending activities of the Corporation.

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT			
	COAST GUARD			
486	Operating expenses-----	\$5, 900, 000	\$4, 500, 000	--\$1, 400, 000
450	Acquisition, construction, and improvement-----	9, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	--4, 000, 000
486	Retired pay-----	625, 000	600, 000	--25, 000
486	Reserve training-----	100, 000	100, 000	-----
	Total, Chapter IV-----	15, 625, 000	10, 200, 000	--5, 425, 000

Administrative expenses of Government corporation

[Limitation on amount of corporate funds to be expended]

H. Doc. No.	Authorization, 1952	Estimate, 1953	Recommended in bill for 1953	Bill compared with— 1952 authorization	1953 estimate
461	Reconstruction Finance Corporation-----	\$16, 850, 000	\$15, 500, 000	--\$2, 250, 000	--\$1, 350, 000

CHAPTER V

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia

CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH, New York

WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana

LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon

FRED E. BUSBEY, Illinois

EDWARD T. MILLER, Maryland

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.—The committee has approved \$6,800,000 of the \$13,600,000 requested. The amount included in the bill will, if approved, increase the total appropriation for 1953 to \$190,360,000. The request was based largely on two factors, the unanticipated increase in claims filed for unemployment benefits and recent changes in State laws and procedures which will result in increased work-loads.

Every time that this item has been brought before the committee during recent years there has been an increase requested to take care of work-loads resulting from changes in State laws and regulations. Total costs of administering the program are still well within the three tenths of one percent tax assessment which was instituted for the purpose of covering these costs. However, if the trend of recent years with regard to State legislation continues, this may not long be the case. It is therefore the desire of the committee that the Department make a thorough study of this situation to determine the additional costs that have resulted from revisions of State laws and regulations during the past five years and the benefits which resulted from these changes. The Department will also be expected to include an analysis of the differences between States as to laws and costs of administration with a view to determining what changes, if any, should be made in the Federal legislation in order to halt the ever increasing cost per unit of work and not prevent needed improvements in the program. The Committee will expect this study to be completed by January 1, 1953. Pending its completion the Bureau is directed not to increase any State's allotment because of a change in the State's laws or regulations relating to this program.

Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program.—The committee has approved \$2,800,000 of the \$3,000,000 requested. No funds were included in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Bill, 1953, due to the fact that no agreement covering the program for 1953 had been negotiated with Mexico at the time that bill was prepared. An agreement, which provides for substantially the same program as that for 1952, has now been consummated. The Bureau estimates

that 275,000 Mexican farm workers will be brought into the United States during 1953 as compared with 200,000 during 1952.

Farm labor supply revolving fund.—The committee has allowed none of the \$270,000 requested. This revolving fund was established by the appropriation of \$1,000,000 in The Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952. It was established with the understanding that the fees collected from employers for certain transportation and subsistence expenses of Mexican farm workers would be sufficient to keep the fund solvent at all times. It is the strong desire of the committee that no additional expenses be assumed by the fund which might jeopardize its solvency.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Education of the Blind.—The committee has approved \$60,000 of the request for \$90,000. The amount in the bill will, if approved, increase the total appropriation for 1953 to \$175,000. This request followed passage of Public Law 354, approved May 22, 1952, which increased the amount authorized to be appropriated annually from \$115,000 to \$250,000. The amount approved, while a reduction in the request for this very worthy project, is an increase of over 50 percent in the appropriation. This is the first year since 1937 that there has been an increase for this item.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Salaries and expenses.—The committee has approved \$60,000 of the \$177,000 requested for the activity "School assistance in federally affected areas." The amount included in the bill will, if approved, increase the total appropriation for this activity during 1953 to \$861,812. The amount approved will provide for the salaries and expenses of 6 of the 12 additional field examiners requested to make field examinations to assure that Federal funds are properly spent. The additional personnel for the Washington office has been disallowed.

Payments to school districts (1952).—The committee has disallowed all of the \$11,570,000 requested. \$40,000,000 has been appropriated for this purpose in 1952. This amount is estimated to cover approximately 76 percent of the maximum amount to which schools in federally affected areas are entitled under Public Law 874. The amount appropriated in 1951 covered approximately 96 percent of such maximum entitlements. It is the opinion of the committee that State and local governments should make provision for bearing a greater share of these costs, especially under circumstances where the increase in Federal activities results in increased income to the area as well as an increase in the number of children to be educated.

It should be noted that the amount expended for grants to schools for operation and maintenance under the Lanham Act totaled less than \$50,000,000 for the entire period of World War II, 1942–1946, inclusive.

School construction.—The committee has disallowed all of the \$80,000,000 requested. The committee reduced the original request for 1953 by only 10 percent, from \$150,000,000 to \$135,000,000, and in-

cluded language to make this amount available immediately upon passage of the Act. The bill was passed by both the House and the Senate in exactly the form in which it was reported by the committee. The committee stated in its report on this bill "The committee wants it to be understood that this action does not in any way indicate that it will look favorably on a request for an additional amount in fiscal year 1953. The agency is expected to plan a program for the entire period from the enactment of this bill to June 30, 1953, within the funds provided." In the face of the action of both Houses of Congress and the very clear expression of the committee to the contrary, the Bureau of the Budget submitted a supplemental request for \$80,000,000 even before the beginning of the 1953 fiscal year. The justifications and verbal testimony were completely devoid of any new information which would justify this action. Neither the Federal Security Agency nor the Office of Education was consulted or given forewarning that this action was contemplated. The Federal Security Agency's Budget Officer said, somewhat in apology for the physical form of the justifications, "This came so suddenly we didn't get the regularly prepared justification * * *." The principal witness who was forced into the position of attempting to defend the estimate said "The first thing I knew about that, Mr. Chairman, was a telephone call last night that this might be up today." The committee is unaware of and does not seek to determine the motives behind this 11th hour proceeding, but certainly such hastily conceived action and flaunting of the obvious intent of Congress ill befits the office that is supposed to lead and set the example for the entire Executive Branch in the field of budgeting the public funds.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Pay costs, Public Law 346.—The committee has approved \$817,750 of the \$961,000 requested, a cut of \$143,250. Public Law 346, approved May 19, 1952, provides for an increase of 4 percent of base pay and 14 percent of allowances for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service. The amount allowed will require the Service to absorb 25 percent of these costs under each of the 16 appropriations where these costs are applicable, with the single exception of the appropriation "Hospitals and medical care." The regular 1953 request for this activity has been cut \$130,000 and, in addition, it was testified that reimbursements to this appropriation from other government agencies are falling below the estimates, upon which the 1953 budget submission was based, to such an extent that the additional pay costs must be appropriated for to avoid the danger of having to reduce services for which the government is committed.

Hospitals and medical care.—The committee has allowed \$500,000 of the request for \$1,042,400 for the specific purpose of making grants to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy.

ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE

Salaries and expenses, Defense Community Facilities and Services.—The committee has approved \$50,000 of the request for \$100,000 to be derived by transfer from funds already appropriated for grants and loans in connection with the Defense Community Facilities and

Services Program. The amount included in the bill will, if approved, increase to \$125,000 the amount available for 1953. The committee has also included language in the bill which provides that none of these funds shall be available after December 31, 1952, except for program liquidation. This action is in keeping with the testimony the committee received indicating that the emergencies, anticipated when this emergency program was established, have not developed.

MINORITY VIEWS

I dissent from the majority opinion on the matter of disapproving requests submitted, by the Federal Commissioner of Education through the United States Bureau of the Budget, for funds necessary to meet the government's obligations on commitments already made under the authority of Public Laws 874 and 815.

To me, the issue resolves itself into one of keeping face with my Colleagues in the House of Representatives and with some six hundred school boards throughout the nation who were advised that they would be entitled to certain sums from the Federal treasury to compensate them for extra expenditures due to government activities within the school districts.

Regular appropriations in the 1951 and 1952 budgets were inadequate and moneys appropriated to carry out the provisions of Public Laws 874 and 815 were diverted to take care of new critical defense areas and not used for the purpose for which they were appropriated.

The matter goes beyond the question of keeping face, it is, in fact, a recognized obligation of the government that every school district impacted through Federal activities would be compensated. To me, this is a contract and the government is not only morally, but legally under obligation to treat the several school districts involved on a basis of equality.

I shall, when this supplemental appropriation reaches the House, offer amendments to restore these two items of \$11,500,000.00 to supplement appropriations under Public Law 874 and \$80,000,000.00 to supplement appropriations under Public Law 815.

WINFIELD K. DENTON.

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY			
506	Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration.	\$13, 600, 000	\$6, 800, 000	—\$6, 800, 000
506	Mexican Farm Labor Program, salaries and expenses	3, 000, 000	2, 800, 000	—200, 000
506	Farm labor supply revolving fund	270, 000	-----	—270, 000
	Total, Department of Labor	16, 870, 000	9, 600, 000	—7, 270, 000
	FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY			
503	American Printing House for the Blind	90, 000	60, 000	—30, 000
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
495	Salaries and expenses	177, 000	60, 000	—117, 000
455	Payments to school districts (1952)	11, 570, 000	-----	—11, 570, 000
511	School construction	80, 000, 000	-----	—80, 000, 000
	Total, Office of Education	91, 747, 000	60, 000	—91, 687, 000

CHAPTER VI
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SUBCOMMITTEE

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio, *Chairman*

W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington

FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts

BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa

IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Construction.—The budget estimate of \$525,000 is recommended for this item. Of the total, \$450,000 will be used for the repair and reconstruction of roads, structures, and utility lines damaged by severe weather and fire during the winter months. The remaining \$75,000 will be used for the purchase of the Gila Pueblo property near Globe, Arizona, as authorized by the act of February 12, 1952 (Public Law 259).

Also, the committee recommends approval of language which waives the personal services limitation in the 1952 bill to the extent necessary to meet the costs of emergency reconstruction or replacement of facilities and the costs of fire suppression activities in the national parks.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
456	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR National Park Service: Construction-----	\$525, 000	\$525, 000	-----

CHAPTER VII

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

SUBCOMMITTEE

ALBERT THOMAS, Texas, *Chairman*

ALBERT GORE, Tennessee

GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama

SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois

JOHN PHILLIPS, California

FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., New York

NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The committee has allowed an estimate of \$50,000 for extraordinary repairs and alterations to the Executive Mansion and the White House Office, but has required that such sum shall be obtained from the appropriation to the President in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, under the heading "Emergency Fund for the President, National Defense". It has been the custom since 1926 to provide the President-elect with funds for minor changes and the committee feels that this practice should be continued.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The committee had under consideration an estimate of \$3,191,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission, consisting of \$3,018,602,000 for construction, including an expansion program, and \$172,398,000 for operating expenses in connection with the expansion program and to meet other increases in financial requirements. In acting on the regular 1953 estimate the Congress has provided for construction costs and operating costs in separate appropriations. The funds for AEC in this bill are provided on the same basis, and the action of the committee thereon is explained under the following appropriate headings.

Operating expenses.—The supplemental estimate for this purpose amounted to \$172,398,000. The committee has allowed a total of \$35,000,000 for this purpose, including \$30,000,000 additional for the weapons program, \$1,500,000 additional for personnel costs, and \$200,000 for expenses of travel. A very substantial part of the reduction in this program is made possible by the denial of requests for funds to restore items which were not allowed in connection with the regular 1953 estimates.

Plant and equipment.—For new plant construction and for the expansion of existing plants the committee considered a supplemental estimate of \$3,018,602,000, including \$2,924,000,000 to initiate the construction of the major elements of the new program. The remaining requirements, amounting to \$94,602,000, resulted from a rescheduling of production and research programs, additional facilities required by recent technical developments, and cost overruns on construction projects. The total cost of the facilities necessary to accomplish

the expansion program is estimated at \$3.9 billion and the program will not be completed for several years. Costs to be incurred during the fiscal year 1953 are estimated at \$600,000,000. The committee has granted \$1,450,000,000 for the expansion and construction program.

The committee has inserted in the bill a provision excepting the commission from compliance with Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes in connection with the costs of cancellation of long-term contracts for electric service and has effected a specific reduction of \$277,000,000 as a result of this provision.

The committee has for the past three or four years urged the Atomic Energy Commission to use competitive bidding based upon plans and specifications. Although the commission and their predecessors have been in the construction business for approximately ten years, the commission feels that it cannot work from plans and specifications. On this point, the committee disagrees. The committee calls attention to the fact that the commission is now engaged on an expansion program which will sizably increase production facilities, and this program will not be completed for approximately two years. With the experience the commission is now getting, and with the experience it has obtained in the past, if it is not able to prepare plans and specifications for this big, new expansion program it will never be able to do so. The reason the committee is anxious for the commission to work from plans and specifications is that it will save millions and millions of dollars (and everybody has agreed on that point), and the committee cannot see where this procedure loses any appreciable amount of time.

In this regard the committee would like to quote from the testimony of the Associated General Contractors of America in which Mr. Marshall advised the committee as follows:

Mr. THOMAS. Can you give us an answer to the problem generally? Can you summarize it generally? I am referring to the problem as it faces the commission.

Mr. MARSHALL. First of all, centralized control of the entire project. Then the development of sufficient information in advance to know how many men are going to be needed, and when, so that they can be brought in in an orderly way.

Mr. THOMAS. How can they reach that point of specific information without plans and specifications?

Mr. MARSHALL. They cannot.

Mr. THOMAS. It cannot be done?

Mr. MARSHALL. No, sir; it cannot.

Mr. THOMAS. And without that, it will be time consuming, a matter of lost motion and an expensive way as contrasted with normal production.

Mr. MARSHALL. You have the problem of recruiting labor. You have the housing problem. You have the problem of compensation for travel or, if this is located in an industrial community, you have the shock that comes to that community because of the labor problem.

Mr. THOMAS. Would it be possible to save time and money, if they took a competent engineer-architect firm and gave them three or four or six or seven months' lead time, to do the over-all planning, and then start from there?

Mr. MARSHALL. I believe it would.

Mr. THOMAS. Is that the answer to the problem?

Mr. FOREMAN. I think so.

Mr. THOMAS. Gentlemen, I think that is the information we have been seeking. We thank you gentlemen for being so very helpful. It was very good of you to take time out from your busy day to come over and help us.

The committee wishes to reemphasize its conviction that very substantial sums of money will be saved with little or no loss of time if

the commission will proceed promptly to formulate a specific program based on engineering plans and specifications, and it invites the commission, after it has followed this procedure, to return to consider the remainder of the financing of the program and its plans and specifications. If the Congress is in session in September the committee would be willing to have the commission appear then. If not, later on, in January, the committee would like AEC to spell out with far more detail their financial requirements, and the commission will be expected to show great progress in preparing plans and specifications for their program by that time.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The committee has approved a supplemental estimate of \$11,400,000 for the purpose of making grants to five hospitals located in the District of Columbia. An appropriation for this purpose is authorized by Public Law 221 of the 82d Congress. The authorizing act provides that the Federal grant shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the project for which such grant is made. The hospitals to receive grants under the appropriation recommended are the Children's Hospital, Providence Hospital, The Lucy Webb Hayes National Training School, including Sibley Memorial Hospital, Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital, and the National Homeopathic Hospital.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Defense Housing.—The committee considered a supplemental estimate of \$62,500,000 for defense housing in critical areas and has recommended an appropriation of \$50,000,000 for this purpose. Public Law 139, approved September 1, 1951, authorized an appropriation of \$50,000,000 for this purpose and pending legislation which has passed the Senate (S. 3066) will, if finally enacted as approved by the Senate, authorize an additional \$50,000,000 for defense housing units. The sum of \$37,500,000 heretofore has been appropriated for this purpose. The amount recommended, together with prior appropriations, will provide a total of \$87,500,000 of the total \$100,000,000 authorization to meet housing needs in defense areas where the shortage is most critical. Funds heretofore appropriated are expected to provide about 9,300 dwelling units. The additional \$50,000,000 provided in the bill will raise the overall total to about 20,000 units. The committee was advised there is a need for 35,000 units of defense housing in critical areas.

Public Housing Administration, Administrative expenses.—The new defense housing authorization contained in pending legislation

(S. 3066) will require additional funds for salaries and expenses of administration and the committee has considered a supplemental estimate proposing an increase of \$1,900,000 for PHA for this purpose. The committee has recommended a total of \$1,433,735. The sum recommended is essential to enable PHA to carry on the construction and management part of the defense housing program which has been delegated to it by the Administrator.

Federal National Mortgage Association.—The committee considered a supplemental request for authorization to use \$800,000 of corporate funds for administrative expenses and has allowed a total of \$680,000 for such purpose. This additional authorization is essential in order to enable FNMA to perform the additional workload placed on it under the provisions of the pending Housing Act of 1952, which, in its present form, would increase the mortgage-purchase authority of the Association by \$900 million. This authorization is made contingent upon enactment into law of the pending legislation (S. 3066).

Alaska Housing.—The bill contains \$4,000,000 for Alaska housing which is \$1,000,000 less than the supplemental estimate. The present authorization of \$15,000,000 contained in Public Law 52 of the 81st Congress has been appropriated, and an additional authorization of \$5,000,000 is pending in S. 3066. Substantially all of the original appropriation of \$15,000,000 has been obligated and the additional \$4,000,000 recommended is to permit continuation of the program of assistance in the development of the Territory.

Slum Clearance and Urban Redevelopment.—The supplemental estimate of \$10,000,000 for this purpose is the first request for capital grants for slum clearance and urban redevelopment requested under the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. Public Law 370, 82d Congress, permits the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make advance or progress payments on capital grant contracts as the work progresses. It is for this purpose that the supplemental estimate is requested. Information presently available is to the effect that about 14 projects may be eligible for progress payments during the fiscal year. In view of the fact there is no firm estimate the committee has allowed an appropriation of \$8,000,000, a reduction of \$2,000,000 in the Budget request.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The bill includes the budget estimate of \$150,000,000 to provide funds for commencing construction of steam electrical generating plants, transmission lines and other facilities necessary to provide power for the expansion program of the Atomic Energy Commission. The two programs go hand in hand and one is useless without the other. The program provides for the construction of ten additional or new generating units with a rated capacity of 1,710,000 kilowatts. The total estimated cost of the program is \$305,000,000.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.—Section 3 of the Act of July 1, 1948, authorizes aid in the form of grants to the Republic of the Philippines for the construction and equipment of hospitals in a sum not exceeding \$22,500,000. An appropriation of \$9,400,000 heretofore has been provided and the committee has had under consideration a supplemental estimate of \$5,000,000 which would provide a total of \$14,400,000, the amount of the lowest bids received by the Philippine Government for the construction and equipment of a 722-bed hospital. The committee is unable to reconcile the estimated cost of constructing this hospital with the known cost of labor in the area. Also, it would appear that a substantial quantity of materials and supplies could be secured locally at a reasonable price. The committee was advised that only two bids were submitted for the construction of this hospital. In view of the foregoing, the committee has deferred recommending the supplemental request and asks the Veterans' Administration to urge the Philippine Government to readvertise for bids with a view to securing a substantial reduction in the estimate for the construction of this hospital, and to eliminate, if possible, any unnecessary ancillary facilities connected with the hospital, which under present plans call for approximately 25 buildings. The committee has no intention of denying the funds for this badly needed hospital. As soon as plans and specifications are revised, if considered desirable, and better bids obtained, the committee will immediately recommend to the House the appropriation of the necessary funds. The committee is in favor of the program.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

The committee considered a supplemental estimate of \$400,000 for administrative expenses of this commission in connection with the settlement of claims authorized by the Act of April 9, 1952, Public Law 303. This Act authorizes payments to former prisoners during World War II who were subjected to inhumane treatment or compelled to perform uncompensated work for the enemy, and for compensation to religious organizations in the Philippines for loss and damage to facilities. The committee wishes to point out that most of the remaining work in connection with the old program has to do with the Philippine veterans, and the Department of the Army has agreed to perform a large part of that work in the Philippines where it has a sizable force. Thus, by using the present staff of the commission for this new work, the committee feels that \$100,000 is ample to perform the additional work required in connection with the new Act of April 9, 1952, for which an estimate of \$400,000 was submitted.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MARITIME ACTIVITIES

Ship construction.—The committee has disallowed the request for authority to use \$200,000 of unobligated funds for the purpose of preparing engineering plans for enlargement of the ways and other facilities at the Wilmington (N. C.) Reserve Shipyard and other similar yards. The purpose of the request is to have plans prepared and in stand-by condition in case of an all-out war. In eliminating the request for funds for this purpose the committee is of the opinion that this work should be performed by existing personnel of the Maritime Administration or the Corps of Engineers and that the request for authority to employ additional personnel for the work is not justified.

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
492	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT Extraordinary Alterations and Repairs, Executive Mansion----	\$50,000	(1)	—\$50,000
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES			
377	American Battle Monuments Commission:			
	Dedication of World War II memorial-----	36,000	\$30,000	—6,000
476	Atomic Energy Commission:			
	Salaries and expenses-----	3,191,000,000	-----	—3,191,000,000
	Operating expenses-----	-----	35,000,000	+35,000,000
	Plant and equipment-----	-----	1,450,000,000	+1,450,000,000
	General Services Administration:			
467	Hospital Facilities in the District of Columbia-----	11,400,000	11,400,000	-----
	Housing and Home Finance Agency:			
	Office of the Administrator:			
507	Defense Housing-----	62,500,000	50,000,000	—12,500,000
507	Federal National Mortgage Association-----	(2)	(1)	-----
507	Alaska Housing-----	5,000,000	4,000,000	—1,000,000

507	Slum Clearance and Urban Redevelopment:				
	Capital Grants.....	10,000,000	8,000,000		-2,000,000
507	Public Housing Administration.....	(4)	(5)		-----
476	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	150,000,000	150,000,000		-----
	Veterans' Administration:				
451	Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....				
466	War Claims Commission:	5,000,000			-5,000,000
	Administrative expenses.....	(6)	(7)		-----
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
	Maritime Activities:				
470	Ship construction.....	(8)			-----
470	War Shipping Administration liquidation.....	(9)	(9)		-----
	Total, Chapter VII.....	3,434,986,000	1,708,430,000		-1,726,556,000

¹ Not to exceed \$50,000 of the funds available for "Emergency Fund for the President, National Defense" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, made available until June 30, 1954, for this purpose.

² Administrative expense limitation for 1953 increased by \$800,000.

³ Administrative expense limitation for 1953 increased by \$680,000.

⁴ Administrative expense limitation for 1953 increased by \$1,900,000.

⁵ Administrative expense limitation for 1953 increased by \$1,433,735.

⁶ Additional \$400,000 from the war claims fund made available in 1953 for administrative expenses.

⁷ Additional \$100,000 from the war claims fund made available in 1953 for administrative expenses.

⁸ Not to exceed \$200,000 of the unobligated balance of prior year funds to be continued available.

⁹ War Shipping Administration liquidation funds made available for payment of claims against "Working fund, Commerce, War Shipping Administration functions, December 31, 1946."

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUBCOMMITTEE

GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas, *Chairman*

HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California
 ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
 JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina
 ALBERT GORE, Tennessee
 ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico
 DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
 FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts

JOHN TABER, New York
 RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
 ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas
 GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin

TITLE I

MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina, *Chairman*

FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts

GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin

To continue the imperative build-up of military construction to provide bases, installations, storage, and other necessary facilities to support our armed forces, the budget estimates of appropriations for fiscal year 1953 total \$2,990,487,740. These estimates were received six days prior to the time that the House Armed Services Committee reported out H. R. 8120 which contains a large part of the authorization for the budget estimates. This bill as reported by the Armed Services Committee (and as subsequently passed by the House on June 12, 1952) altered the basis of authorization anticipated in the budget estimates. The following table summarizes the adjustment and the action of the committee in the accompanying bill.

Summary on Military Public Works

	Budget estimate	Adjustment to conform to H. R. 8120 structure	Adjusted budget estimates	Committee bill	Bill compared with adjusted estimates
Office of Secretary (military construction, foreign countries).....	\$650,000,000	—\$502,800,000	\$147,200,000	-----	—\$147,200,000
Department of the Army (military construction).....	414,515,000	+239,575,000	654,090,000	\$600,090,000	—54,000,000
Department of the Navy (public works).....	387,972,740	+33,225,000	421,197,740	386,409,840	—34,787,900
Department of the Air Force (acquisition and construction of real property).....	1,538,000,000	+230,000,000	1,768,000,000	1,200,000,000	—568,000,000
Total, Department of Defense, military public works.....	2,990,487,740	-----	2,990,487,740	2,186,499,840	—803,987,900

¹ The original bill before the House Armed Services Committee carried an authorization for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the establishment and development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries (NATO), in a so-called title 5. The budget estimates included \$650 million partial funding of this proposed authorization in 1953. Title 5 was stricken in its entirety, and the portions thereof applicable to unilateral (full cost) financing by the United States redistributed to each of the three military departments. This accounts for the \$502,800,000 in the second column which is divided among the three services. The balance of \$147,200,000 is for multilateral financing (in which the United States and foreign governments are to participate), no provision for which is included in H. R. 8120 as passed by the House.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The timing of the appropriation request for military construction, actually preceding as it did the authorization bill, created a serious problem for the committee. It was necessary to start hearings on June 9, three days in advance of House action on H. R. 8120. The time lag in submitting the authorization requests to Congress was largely due to the inability of the Air Force, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget to decide upon a program for the Air Force until the last hour. The committee understands that the Army and the Navy both had firm programs in January but were forced to wait upon the Air Force. In the hearings, therefore, the Army and Navy presentations were well prepared and understandable. However, the Air Force request was admittedly premised on certain assumptions which were difficult to follow. This problem will be developed more fully below.

Despite the extreme shortness of time allowed the committee to consider the military construction requests, the committee had availed itself of a running head-start on the entire problem by commencing hearings in February on the construction performance by the three services for the 14-month period ended August 31, 1951. These hearings, although identified as an "Investigation of Military Public Works," actually were in the nature of an exhaustive study of all the ramifications of appropriation, apportionment, planning, contracting, and construction of military public works by the services. They extended over the months, right up to the day of the hearings on the 1953 appropriation requests. In their course, the committee deemed it desirable and necessary to make a thorough study of the Moroccan Air Base operations, and accord a full hearing to all concerned. The Corps of Engineers and the contractor have been heard in full. The Air Force was represented throughout and the committee has invited both the Air Force and the architect-engineer firm to make a presentation of their position. It is expected this will take place shortly at which time the Moroccan record will be complete and the committee will file its report. In addition the committee will shortly file a separate report on the full military public works investigation.

Turning to the committee action on the appropriation requests, the committee is convinced that economies can and should be effected in military construction. One sound approach is the standardization of design for repetitive structures such as barracks, bachelor officer quarters, warehouses, administration buildings, mess halls, hospitals, etc. Throughout the investigation hearings the committee emphasized the vital importance of this approach and served due notice on each of the services that they must achieve a large degree of standardization in the 1953 program. The services have reported substantial steps forward in this direction, and each point to a standard barracks design recently firmed up. The result is a separate standard barracks for each of the services peculiarly adaptable to their respective requirements. The standard designs embody a sizeable reduction of the gross area per man without reducing each man's living space, and this feature alone represents extensive savings.

The second approach upon which the committee insists is the maximum utilization of existing structures. The services are not to build to replace existing structures and are not to build new structures

if any practicable means can be devised to utilize those already existing. More attention must be given to this problem, and promptly.

Another matter that was fully discussed with the services during the hearings was the absolute requirement that the money is to be expended for complete increments, that is, completely usable facilities. For example, the Air Force and Navy are not to build half a runway or half a hangar. The Army and Navy are not to build portions of a warehouse or a barracks. The services each gave the committee their firm pledge that this will be done.

The committee is at a loss to understand the action of the executive departments with respect to funds provided for advance planning. These funds are appropriated for the purpose of assuring that the armed services will accomplish sufficient advance study on unauthorized projects in order that their requests for authorization and appropriation will be sound. Specific continuing authorization for such funds was written into the 1952 authorization act (Public Law 155, 82d Congress). The appropriation bill which followed shortly thereafter carried advance planning money for the Navy of \$5,000,000, for the Army of \$10,000,000, and for the Air Force of \$5,000,000. The services have strongly and repeatedly urged that such funds be made available, and Congress has fully recognized their efficacy. The Navy asked for and received from the Bureau of the Budget an apportionment of \$2.5 million in order to plan the current 1953 program. The Navy used the money wisely and the committee has accordingly had the benefit of a well prepared Navy program. In the case of the Army, the Bureau of the Budget refused to release the \$10,000,000 when requested in early March 1952. The result was that the Army had been forced to borrow \$6,000,000 from construction projects in the 1952 program in order to do the necessary advance planning for 1953. Not until the early part of June did the Bureau of the Budget release the \$10,000,000 to the Army. Of all three services the Air Force needed advance planning money the most and the Air Force's experience in this regard is paradoxical. On paper, the Bureau of the Budget released the \$5,000,000 advance planning money to the Air Force on November 17, 1951. However, the testimony in the hearings was uniformly to the effect that the Air Force was not permitted to use this money for advance planning until April 1952, long after the 1953 program was developed. This type of interdepartmental interference with the intent of Congress is not to be repeated.

The current bill provides ample funds to each of the three services for advance planning: \$52,620,000 for the Air Force; \$5,000,000 for the Army; and \$2.5 million for the Navy. Each of the services testified that these amounts were adequate and the committee fully expects that these funds will be released for the purpose just as soon as the services develop a further military public works program and it is approved by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget.

The committee has found it necessary to assure a better check on the utilization of the money in this bill. To this end, the committee has directed each service to furnish a monthly report on the obligation of the funds by line item and also to furnish with the monthly report a copy of all requests for apportionments and of all backup data in support thereof. In the case of the Air Force, the monthly

report will not be against line items, but will be against the categories and commands carried in the Air Force formula which will be discussed below.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The budget estimate recommends the deletion of sections 602, 603, and 604 of last year's bill. The reason for this recommendation was requested from each of the three services, from the Office of Secretary of Defense, and from the Bureau of the Budget. Sections 602 and 603 contain important restrictions on the use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts and the "buying of construction time." They are both sound. Section 604 restricts the construction of laundry and dry cleaning facilities. None of the services expressed any objection to the continuance of the sections. The Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the Secretary of Defense seem lukewarm to the need for carrying them in the law but concede they are sound provisions. The committee has retained all three sections (designated as secs. 802, 803, and 804 in the accompanying bill) and has added to section 804 a restriction on the construction of bakeries in addition to laundry and dry cleaning facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The budget estimate for the Air Force is in the amount of \$1.538 billion for 1953. (As explained at the outset of this chapter of the report, \$230 million was added to this figure by the House Armed Services Committee to provide military installations and facilities in foreign countries where the United States is paying the full cost on a unilateral basis. Therefore, the Air Force request totals \$1.768 billion). The committee recommends \$1.2 billion, a reduction of \$568 million.

For the purpose of immediate discussion consider the \$1.538 billion requested figure. This request is not against authorization of the same amount, but instead is against authorization in the amount of \$1.860 billion. What the Air Force is seeking to do is to obtain funds with which to build facilities costing \$1.860 billion, with only \$1.538 billion. The reason for this anomaly is that the Bureau of the Budget did not permit the Air Force to ask for more than the \$1.538 billion. At the same time, however, no deletions of any kind or character have been made from the actual physical bases, structures, and facilities which the Air Force desires to build to cost \$1.860 billion. In order to achieve this financial legerdemain, the Air Force adopted a purely fictitious basis for its appropriation presentation to the committee. The proposition is this: The Air Force would fund all the construction in the United States only to the extent of 75 percent, and still not leave anything out. Overseas, the funding would be 61.745 percent for some projects and 100 percent for others. The Air Force insists that this would not mean the construction of only 75 percent of a runway and 75 percent of a hangar in the United States, or 61.745 percent of such facilities overseas. To the contrary, the Air Force intends to build each of the facilities in toto. The result is phantom figures which have no meaning whatever.

The fiction does not end here. In the matter of 11 overseas projects, including bases in the United Kingdom, the House Armed Services

Committee did not permit authorization in the full amount of the Air Force request. The Air Force is not content to make any deletions of the actual physical structures from these bases, but recognizes that it must stay within the dollar amount authorized. In order to have all the bases and everything on them, the Air Force has requested this committee for funds to cover each and everyone of the facilities which will cost more than the authorization amount. The Air Force solution is simple—simply reduce the cost factor of 2.5 to 1.5. In other words the Air Force knows what the cost will be, and has cut the cost factor to the extent necessary to get everything it feels it needs and not have enough money to pay for it.

This sophistry caused the committee deep concern, and the committee decided upon forthright action in the form of getting directly from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Director of the Budget clear, full and frank statements.

In the first place the committee learned that the 1952 public works program for the three services was far from being firm, even though the committee had been given assurances at the time that the program was firm. As to the 1953 program, the committee learned from the Director of the Budget that it had been presented to both the Armed Services Committee and to this committee at too late a date "to do an effective job of reviewing and examining", and that the figures and justifications before the committee are not firm in some unidentified particulars. The Director further stated that he did not like the situation any better than the committee did, and that more of a machinery or mechanism for review in the Department of Defense is necessary than exists at the present time. (This discussion centered primarily around the Air Force program). The Director also frankly conceded that a dual standard for action by the Bureau of the Budget has apparently developed—one basis for presentation to the Congress in order to get appropriations, and a second or review basis by the Bureau of the Budget before funds are released for the construction of those items justified to the Congress.

The committee had before it and gave serious consideration to the statements made off the record by the Secretaries of Defense and of the Air Force. From these discussions the committee has arrived at the figures in the accompanying bill, using its own judgment as indicated in this report.

Getting directly to the matter of appropriations for fiscal year 1953, the Secretary of the Air Force advised the committee that the Air Force does not have a firm program and would do wrong if it were to attempt a firm program. This statement is fully understandable. When the Air Force justified its 1952 program to the Congress in September 1951, it was on the basis of a 95-wing program and the appropriations were made on that basis. However, before that program could get off the ground, there was a top policy decision to expand the Air Force to 143 wings. As a result, only \$700,000,000 of the 1952 appropriation of \$2.2 billion will be obligated by June 30, 1952, leaving a carry-over to the new fiscal year of unobligated money in the amount of about \$1.5 billion. The Secretary and other Air Force officials stated that it would have been wrong for the Air Force to obligate the 1952 money on any faster basis because it could not have been obligated against the new 143-wing program. This appears logical to the committee.

The Air Force testified that it will not be able to obligate the \$1.5 billion carry-over until December 31, 1952, and further that planning lead time is required for the money being requested for 1953. This planning will require a period of 4 to 6 months. So long as planning money is made available for this purposes—and the committee is allowing \$52,620,000—the Air Force will be able to continue its base structure build-up on schedule. The next question is how much construction money will be needed to continue construction in the early months of calendar year 1953. The Secretary of the Air Force very frankly stated that if the committee were to appropriate the requested \$1.538 billion, it would have to do so blindly, and that he does not like to ask the committee to do this.

At this juncture the committee was remitted to the position of working some semblance of order from a very confused, unsatisfactory picture. The primary and predominant consideration is, and necessarily is, to support the Air Force in its sorely needed build-up of base structures to match planes and personnel. This must be done at all odds. The committee is decidedly disappointed at the lag in the construction of Air Force bases. As of June 30, 1952, only a fractional part of the air base build-up for 143 wings will be under way. This is less than expected by the Congress. The pace must be accelerated. Congress has not failed at any stage to provide the funds, and will not do so. However, the Congress must have a firm basis upon which to support the Air Force and at the same time to discharge its own responsibilities in the matter.

The committee requested the Air Force Secretary to present a program, in lieu of the budget request, which will not in any sense retard the build-up of air striking power, and at the same time assure on the part of the Air Force and the Department of Defense an opportunity to take a reading on where the Air Force is going in construction. The Secretary agreed with this approach and studied the matter carefully. The net result is an approach satisfactory to the committee and to the Air Force. The Secretary stated that the Air Force requires an appropriation at this time of \$1.250 billion, including \$52,260,000 for planning money. The first indication on his part was that this amount would run the Air Force until April 1, but in the final stages he stated that it would carry until June 1, provided the Air Force is given a supplemental appropriation by April 1. What is then involved is the money which the Air Force believes it can obligate in the first 3 to 5 months of calendar 1953. There is some uncertainty in the expected rate of obligation. The best estimate of the Air Force is \$250–\$300 million a month for those months. Although the Air Force proposed a formula on the basis of \$1.250 billion for this period, the committee feels strongly that \$1.2 billion will be fully adequate for the purpose, and has allowed that much.

In this approach to a very complex problem, the committee has found it necessary to earmark the \$1.2 billion against air commands in the United States and overseas and to types of activities within the commands. The Air Force is agreeable to this type of control and has submitted a formula in effectuation thereof. The total appropriation is being made against a total authorization of \$2,461 billion. This dispels to the extent possible the original fictitious Air Force approach and puts the entire program on an understandable and controllable basis. The Acting Chief of Staff of the Air Force was present at the

discussion in the hearings of this approach, and he stated that the plan is a very good and workable one.

The formula is shown in the tables which immediately follow. The first table is for appropriations within the United States which total \$560 million, and the second table is for overseas which total \$690 million. These figures total \$1.250 billion. As stated previously, the committee feels that \$1.2 billion is fully adequate and therefore it is necessary that each category and command in the tables be reduced by 4 percent. The figures shown in the tables include unilateral funding of the NATO bases for which the House Armed Service Committee added \$230 million to the Air Force authorization. The tables are as follows:

ZONE OF INTERIOR

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

Command category--within the United States	Pavements	Operation facilities, including commercial navigation aids and POL	Housing, troop and family	Maintenance, storage, and shops	Medical facilities	Administration, community and training	Land, utilities, harbors and docks	Research and development, laboratories and miscellaneous	Total
Strategic Air Command:									
Authorization.....	\$155,768	\$43,042	\$74,142	\$68,225	\$10,973	\$6,251	\$50,753	\$7,500	\$416,654
Appropriation.....	115,000	30,000	50,000	45,000	7,000	4,000	30,000	4,000	285,000
Air Defense Command:									
Authorization.....	14,064	8,630	12,165	20,996	1,515	3,753	15,222	82	76,487
Appropriation.....	9,000	5,000	9,000	12,000	1,000	1,000	8,000	0	45,000
Tactical Air Command:									
Authorization.....	31,014	8,590	24,353	24,060	2,035	2,292	9,477	0	101,816
Appropriation.....	20,000	5,000	15,000	12,000	1,000	1,000	6,000	0	60,000
Air Training Command:									
Authorization.....	53,150	8,031	29,550	25,757	84	12,229	10,247	0	140,048
Appropriation.....	33,000	4,000	15,000	15,000	0	10,000	8,000	0	85,000
Research and Development Command:									
Authorization.....	14,066	1,236	8,057	11,858	242	5,500	11,416	49,422	101,797
Appropriation.....	6,000	500	3,000	3,000	0	2,500	2,000	3,000	20,000
Other:									
Authorization.....	26,673	10,399	14,097	84,683	492	14,815	30,361	71,737	253,257
Appropriation.....	9,000	6,000	6,000	24,000	0	9,000	9,000	2,000	65,000
Total, United States:									
Authorization.....	294,735	79,983	162,369	236,579	15,341	44,830	127,476	128,741	1,090,059
Appropriation.....	192,000	50,500	98,000	111,000	9,000	27,500	63,000	9,000	560,000

U. S. Air Force public works appropriation schedule, fiscal year 1953—Continued

OVERSEAS

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

Command category—Overseas	Pavements	Operation facilities including communication and navigational aids, POL and AC & W	Housing, troop and family	Maintenance, storage and shops	Medical facilities	Administration, community and training	Land, utilities, harbors and docks	Residual funding	Total
Alaskan Air Command:									
Authorization.....	\$26,120	\$14,962	\$37,425	\$11,436	\$1,714	\$565	\$41,689	0	\$133,911
Appropriation.....	7,000	6,000	15,300	5,000	1,700	0	25,000	-----	60,000
Far East Air Forces:									
Authorization.....	40,376	15,574	25,970	9,477	-----	5,087	11,521	\$2,838	110,843
Appropriation.....	15,000	7,500	15,000	4,000	0	2,000	5,000	1,500	50,000
North East Air Command:									
Authorization.....	86,904	32,556	6,335	31,118	-----	488	26,594	19,925	203,920
Appropriation.....	32,000	25,000	4,000	20,000	0	0	20,000	19,000	120,000
United States Air Force in Europe:									
Authorization.....	133,240	40,849	28,000	47,648	3,469	7,238	33,151	45,165	338,760
Appropriation.....	70,000	20,000	15,000	23,500	1,500	3,000	15,000	42,000	190,000
Authorization (unilateral NATO)	25,000	9,000	85,000	58,000	12,000	23,000	18,000	0	230,000
Appropriation.....	9,000	3,000	30,000	20,000	4,000	8,000	6,000	0	80,000
Military Air Transport Service									
Authorization.....	92,079	25,902	6,688	13,697	2,852	675	28,701	1,069	171,663
Appropriation.....	48,000	14,000	4,000	8,000	1,500	0	14,000	500	90,000
Other:									
Authorization.....	-----	126,977	-----	25,315	0	1,074	3	29,000	182,369
Appropriation.....	0	80,000	0	20,000	0	0	0	0	100,000
Total overseas:									
Authorization.....	403,719	285,820	189,418	196,691	20,035	38,127	159,659	97,997	1,371,466
Appropriation.....	181,000	155,500	83,300	100,500	8,700	13,000	85,000	63,000	690,000
Grand total:									
Authorization.....	698,554	345,708	351,787	433,270	35,376	82,937	287,135	226,738	2,461,525
Appropriation.....	373,000	206,000	181,300	211,500	17,700	40,500	145,000	72,000	1,230,000

The authorization amount shown in these tables is composed of \$2,089,277,000 carried in H. R. 8120, and \$372,248,000 of unfunded prior years' authorization, totaling \$2,461,525,000.

The Air Force has requested some flexibility in the application of the funds as between commands, and the committee feels that this is reasonable. Therefore, the Air Force may vary total funding within the various commands not to exceed 10 percent without referral to the Appropriation Committees. No flexibility is permitted between the categories of activities without prior referral to the Appropriations Committees. The committee is to be kept advised of the obligations of funds by commands and by categories in the form of monthly reports which are to be accompanied by copies of requests for apportionments of funds and back-up data in support thereof.

The appropriation of \$1.2 billion includes a total of \$52,620,000 which shall be made available immediately for planning and may be withdrawn from any of the commands or categories with later adjustments at the option of the Air Force between commands or categories to replace up to the original amount where required to prosecute the construction program. The Air Force has agreed that it does not need planning funds separate from the total appropriation against which the planning funds may be drawn. These planning funds are to include advance planning, master planning, and investigational engineering.

The Air Force has authorization for construction at Lincoln, Nebraska, of \$9,093,000 for the Strategic Air Command. The field at Lincoln, Nebraska, is currently a municipal airport which is being used also by an Air National Guard unit, a Ground National Guard unit, and by the Navy for training purposes. The Air Force has decided to install its Strategic Air Command Base at Lincoln, and has given notice to the Navy that it will have to readjust its own facilities on the field or else move to another base. The Navy has chosen the latter course and has proposed in its own appropriation request that it be permitted to expend \$3,500,000 at the Omaha Municipal Airport at Omaha, Nebraska. The committee discussed this matter with representatives of both the Air Force and the Navy in the hearings and the committee has concluded after considering the question that the Air Force and the Navy should jointly study the situation further. For that reason the committee has inserted in the bill a proviso that no funds shall be expended (except for planning) in connection with the proposed Strategic Air Command installation at Lincoln Municipal Airport, Lincoln, Nebraska.

The Air Force bases upon which construction is permitted by the appropriation made in the bill within the continental United States are listed by base in the following tabulation:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Barksdale AFB | 11. Hunter AFB |
| 2. Biggs AFB | 12. Lake Charles AFB |
| 3. Carswell AFB | 13. Lakeland Apt. |
| 4. Castle AFB | 14. Limestone AFB |
| 5. Clinton NAS | 15. Limestone Aux. A & B |
| 6. Davis-Monthan AFB | 16. Lincoln AFB ¹ |
| 7. Dow AFB | 17. Little Rock AFB |
| 8. Fairchild AFB | 18. Lockbourne AFB |
| 9. Forbes AFB | 19. MacDill AFB |
| 10. Homestead-Dade Co. Apt. | 20. March AFB |

¹ Planning only.

21. Mt. Home AFB
22. Offutt AFB
23. Plattsburg Barracks
24. Rapid City AFB
25. Sedalia AFB
26. Selman Field
27. Sioux City Mun. Apt.
28. Smoky Hill AFB
29. Stead AFB
30. Turner AFB
31. Tye Field
32. Walker AFB
33. Westover AFB
34. Burlington Apt.
35. Duluth Mun. Apt.
36. Geiger Field
37. Greater Pittsburgh Apt.
38. Hamilton AFB
39. Houma Gunnery Range
40. Kinross AF Aux.
41. Larson AFB
42. Majors Field
43. McChord AFB
44. McGhee-Tyson Apt.
45. Minneapolis-St. Paul Int. Apt.
46. Newcastle Co. Apt.
47. Niagara Falls Mun. Apt.
48. O'Hare Int'l Apt.
49. Oscoda AFB
50. Otis AFB
51. Oxnard AFB
52. Paine Field
53. Palmdale-Los Angeles Apt.
54. Portland Int'l Apt.
55. Presque Isle AFB
56. Selfridge AFB
57. Stewart AFB
58. Suffolk AFB
59. Truax Field
60. Punta Gorda
61. Yuma Co. Apt.
62. AC & W Canada
63. AC & W U. S.
64. Alexandria Mun. Apt.
65. Altus AFB
66. Ardmore Mun. Apt.
67. Blytheville Mun. Apt.
68. Bunker Hill NAS
69. Charleston Mun. Apt.
70. Clovis AFB
71. Donaldson AFB
72. Galveston Mun. Apt.
73. Myrtle Beach AFB
74. Raleigh-Durham Mun. Apt.
75. Seymour-Johnson Fld.
76. Sewart AFB
77. Shaw AFB
78. Big Spring AFB
79. Bryan AFB
80. Connally, James AFB
81. Craig AFB
82. Ellington AFB
83. Foster Field
84. Goodfellow AFB
85. Haringen All-Valley Mun. Apt.
86. Laredo Mun. Apt.
87. Laughlin AFB
88. Luke AFB
89. Mather AFB—
90. Moody AFB
91. Moore Field
92. Nellis AFB
93. Perrin AFB
94. Pinecastle AFB
95. Randolph AFB
96. Reese AFB
97. Scott AFB
98. Tyndall AFB
99. Vance AFB—
100. Wichita AFB
101. Williams AFB
102. Birmingham Mod. Ctr
103. Brookley AFB
104. Gentile Spec'd Depot
105. Hammonton AFB
106. Hill AFB
107. Kelly AFB
108. Lynn Haven Pet. Stge.
109. Norton AFB
110. Robins AFB
111. 831st Spec'd Depot Shelby
112. Tinker AFB
113. Wright-Patterson AFB
114. Palm Beach Int'l Apt. (Morrisson)
115. Camp Beale
116. Dobbins AFB
117. Godman AFB
118. Long Beach Mun. Apt.
119. Various
120. Arnold Eng Dev. Ctr.
121. Bedford Res. Ctr. (Hanscom)
122. Hqs. ARDC
123. Edwards AFB
124. Griffiss AFB
125. Holloman AFB
126. Lockland Plant
127. Patrick AFB
128. Kirtland AFB
129. Eglin AFB
130. Bolling AFB
131. Gunter AFB
132. Maxwell AFB
133. School of Aviation Med. Brooks AFB
134. Various—Comm. & Navaid Fac.
135. Various—Land & Utils. Wherry Housing
136. Various—Overrun Prev. Budget
137. Various—Community Fac.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The budget estimate for the Navy is in the amount of \$387,972,740 for 1953. (As explained at the outset of this chapter of the report, \$33,225,000 was added to this figure by the House Armed Services Committee to provide NATO facilities where the United States is paying the full cost on a unilateral basis. Therefore, the Navy request totals \$421,197,740.) Of this amount, \$16,347,000 was for projects not authorized in H. R. 8120 as finally passed by the House and of course no appropriations are being made therefor. The committee recommends \$386,409,840, a total reduction of \$34,787,900, of which the afore-mentioned \$16,347,000 is a part.

The committee has had the benefit of a thorough preview of the Naval construction program in the extensive investigation hearings. The Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, on the basis of developments in those hearings, initiated a new program of direct check on the various Naval Districts for the purpose of screening plans and specifications drawn for construction. The result has been most gratifying. After only three months of operation under this new system, the Navy reported to the committee on June 11, 1952, that economies had been effected to the extent of \$32,000,000 on the 1952 construction program of \$800,000,000, or an over-all total of 4 percent. This is a commendable performance which the committee is pleased to recognize. The screening has been carried into the pending appropriation request so that the pending figure is actually \$16,000,000, or 4 percent, less than it otherwise would have been.

The committee is satisfied as to the soundness of the Navy budget and that installations contained in the 1953 program (with certain exceptions noted below) are needed for the buildup of shore facilities necessary by the readiness date to support the fleet. There are certain projects which can be deferred at this time, however, and the committee recommends that they be deferred.

The Navy budget includes funds to move its aviation training facilities from Lincoln Municipal Airport, Nebraska, to Omaha Municipal Airport, Nebraska, as a part of the Air Force's proposal to install a Strategic Air Command Base at Lincoln. (This was discussed in the Air Force portion of this chapter.) The committee strongly feels that the Navy should not be provided with funds in the amount of \$3.5 million to build new facilities at Omaha in advance of a joint Air Force-Navy study of the over-all problem, and has, therefore, deleted this item.

The budget included several items for expansion of Naval hospital and other medical facilities, including the sum of \$11,679,000 for a permanent hospital of 800 beds on a 1,500-bed chassis at Norfolk, Virginia. This buildup of hospital facilities is logical and needed. However, \$2,500,000 was appropriated in the 1952 bill for acquisition of land, architect-engineer services, site preparation and foundations for the Norfolk hospital. This advance work is underway, and it appears that this project will not be retarded if construction funds are deferred at this time.

The request for \$700,000 for an addition to the Medical Radiological Research Laboratory at Bethesda, Maryland, is an item that the committee believes can be deferred at this time and the committee has accordingly deleted it.

There are two other items in the Navy program which, in the opinion of the committee, can be deferred, and the committee has also deleted them. One is an item for post maintenance shops and administration building at Quantico, Virginia, totaling \$2,210,000, and \$351,900 to relocate the telescope from the Naval Observatory in Washington, D. C., to Flagstaff, Arizona.

The Navy has demonstrated a deplorable lack of foresight, and candor with the committee on a previous occasion in the matter of land acquisition for the Naval Amphibious Base at Little Creek, Virginia. The item for purchase of an additional 127.7 acres is not being deleted, but the committee is displeased at the Navy's defective planning for this base.

A final item in the Navy program of which the committee desires to take note is the one for improvements to the water aqueduct at Key West, Florida. The request is for \$495,000. This work is proposed to be done by reason of the Navy's obligation under a contract to furnish water for the civilian population of Key West in addition to its prime obligation to furnish water for the Governmental installation there. The committee feels that the Navy should examine carefully the propriety of increasing the civilian water rates in light of this additional expenditure upon the part of the Government on this aqueduct and related facilities. From the testimony in the hearings it appears that this additional investment is solely for civilian use. If this is the case, it is expected that the civilian beneficiaries will amortize its cost.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The budget estimate for the Army is in the amount of \$414,515,000 for 1953. (As explained at the outset of this chapter of the report, \$239,575,000 was added to this figure by the House Armed Services Committee to provide NATO facilities where the United States is paying the full cost on a unilateral basis. Therefore, the Army request totals \$654,090,000.) The committee recommends \$600,090,000, a reduction of \$54,000,000.

In the committee's study of the construction performance by the Corps of Engineers for the 14 months' period ending August 31, 1951, the committee was impressed with the magnitude of the construction operations which the Army Corps of Engineers is expected to perform. They are of far greater scope than those of the Navy's Bureau of Yards and Docks. The Corps of Engineers has a responsibility for the construction of all of the Army construction projects, and in large measure for the Air Force construction projects, in addition to the civil works projects within the United States. Throughout the build-up period since the commencement of hostilities in Korea in June 1950, the Corps of Engineers has not had available to it a sufficient number of trained engineer officers to undertake the vast responsibilities thrust upon the Corps. As a result, it fairly appears that the Corps has been spread thin.

Although in the investigation hearings the Navy took the cue from the committee and inaugurated the system of screening described previously herein with the resultant savings of 4 percent on the 1952 public works program, the Corps of Engineers because of its decentralization and broader construction undertakings was apparently not able

to give the same attention to the need for the economies which can and will result from a careful screening of construction projects.

The committee definitely feels that the Corps should have the opportunity to devise an appropriate system of achieving economies in its construction operations and that if this is done the Corps will be able to report on the 1953 construction program embodied in this bill savings in at least the amount of 4 percent, commensurate with those achieved by the Navy. Therefore, the committee has reduced the Army appropriation request by approximately 4 percent, or \$24,000,000.

Another factor taken into consideration is the fact that many of the Army projects in the 1953 budget have not had the benefit of advance planning in that there was a reluctance on the part of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget to make advance planning funds available to the Corps. It is the feeling of the committee that no time will be lost in the construction of Army projects covered by the current request if the planning lead time of 4 to 6 months is devoted to planning. At the conclusion of this planning the Corps should be in a better position to determine which projects can be deferred and which projects can be undertaken on a more economical basis.

The committee strongly feels that the \$54,000,000 reduction in the Army request is fully warranted under the circumstances. There are three specific items which may well be able to absorb a goodly part of the reduction. The first of these is barracks spaces. Army representatives testified that there are at this time 296,798 empty spaces in permanent Army barracks. In the current budget the Army is asking for \$37,000,000 for an additional 16,900 permanent barracks spaces and another item of \$1.1 million for 1,040 modified emergency barracks spaces. These figures total \$38.1 million for additional barracks spaces. The second item is the Army request for \$12.8 million for operational and administrative facilities. There is undoubtedly some area in these proposed programs which can be substantially reduced without harm to the over-all buildup. The items for the additional barracks spaces and for the additional operational and administrative facilities total \$50.9 million. The committee feels that probably as much as 50 percent can be deleted from these two items, or at least a third for the present.

In the matter of the construction of additional barracks spaces, there should be no construction of additional barracks spaces on those bases and installations where there are empty spaces at this time. Stated another way, those bases and stations should be the last to get new barracks, if there is enough money left to build barracks there.

The third item which gave the committee some concern was the buildup of expensive living quarters at research bases such as Sandia, New Mexico, and other places. The committee desires to make it abundantly clear that in this austerity program of military construction there is no room for "plush" features of construction anywhere. Conservation of dollars is just as important as the buildup of military strength. There is a definite compatibility between the two, and it is the decided duty of the military to trim from construction projects all items of over-design, elaborateness, excessive spacing and furbelows.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

SUBCOMMITTEE

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida, *Chairman*

DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania

ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas

ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

The bill includes \$1,400,000 for the construction of buildings and facilities in Alaska, a reduction of \$1,980,700 from the budget estimate. The total request of \$3,380,700 was based on both existing and pending legislative authority. The committee is advised that H. R. 7725 which contains the additional legislative authority on which a part of the requested appropriation was based will not in all probability be enacted into law during this Congress. It is therefore recommending an amount to cover the currently authorized projects less the cost of certain authorized projects for which apparently there is no need and which the Army has proposed be deauthorized.

The committee in its report on the regular bill for the Department of the Army suggested that the Army consider transferring operation of the Alaska Communications System to a management fund. This suggestion is now restated, and in addition it is suggested that the Bureau of the Budget review all business-type activities in Alaska, including construction of housing and the Alaska Railroad, with the view of recommending legislation to place the operation of those activities under one corporate or management fund. It has been apparent for some time, with the continued economic growth of this Territory, that the combined military and commercial operation of these enterprises has not been overly satisfactory from either a military or fiscal standpoint and should be separated. The committee will expect the Bureau of the Budget to make a full report on this subject at the time of presentation of the budget for 1954.

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE			
	TITLE I			
	MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS			
485	Office of Secretary of Defense (military construction, foreign countries)-----	\$650, 000, 000	-----	-\$650, 000, 000
485	Department of the Army (military construction)-----	414, 515, 000	\$600, 090, 000	+ 185, 575, 000
485	Department of the Navy (public works)-----	387, 972, 740	386, 409, 840	- 1, 562, 900
485	Department of the Air Force (acquisition and construction of real property)-----	1, 538, 000, 000	1, 200, 000, 000	- 338, 000, 000
	Total, military public works-----	2, 990, 487, 740	2, 186, 499, 840	- 803, 987, 900
	TITLE II			
488	Department of the Army (construction, Alaska Communications System)-----	3, 380, 700	1, 400, 000	- 1, 980, 700
	Total, chapter VIII-----	2, 993, 868, 440	2, 187, 899, 840	- 805, 968, 600

CHAPTER IX

MUTUAL SECURITY

SUBCOMMITTEE

J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia, *Chairman*

JOHN J. ROONEY, New York

RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts

JOE B. BATES, Kentucky

FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., New York

CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH, New York

CLIFF CLEVINGER, Ohio

SCOPE OF CHAPTER

The committee considered estimates totalling \$6,526,060,750 covering the titles "Government and Relief in Occupied Areas", "Government in Occupied Areas", and "The Mutual Security Program". These estimates are contained in the President's budget at pages 711-713, and 916-917, and in House Documents 510 and 512, respectively. These programs are administered by: the Department of Defense, through the Department of the Army, for the Government and Relief in Occupied Areas activity; the Department of State for the Government in Occupied Areas activity; and the Office of the Director for Mutual Security, in conjunction with the Mutual Security Agency, the Department of Defense, and the Department of State, for the Mutual Security Program.

The table which follows summarizes the committee action by major title of appropriation. The detailed tabulation appears at the conclusion of this chapter.

Summary of committee action

Title	Agency or item	Appropriation, 1952	Estimates, 1953	Recommended in this bill	Bill compared with—	
					Appropriations, 1952	Estimates, 1953
I	Government and Relief in Occupied Areas.....	\$22,500,000	\$12,820,000	\$11,000,000	—\$11,500,000	—\$1,820,000
II	Government in Occupied Areas.....	26,880,000	20,500,000	19,000,000	—7,880,000	—1,500,000
III	Mutual Security:					
	Title I—Europe.....	5,774,615,847	4,698,057,750	4,556,257,750	—1,218,358,097	—141,800,000
	Title II—Near East and Africa.....	552,506,000	741,430,500	711,430,500	+138,924,500	—30,000,000
	Title III—Asia and Pacific.....	920,542,866	931,220,000	862,220,000	—58,322,866	—69,000,000
	Title IV—American Republics.....	55,995,633	78,014,750	72,014,750	+16,019,097	—6,000,000
	Title V—Miscellaneous Economic Assistance.....	25,243,610	44,017,750	44,017,750	+18,774,140	-----
	Subtotal, Mutual Security.....	7,328,903,976	6,492,740,750	6,245,940,750	—1,082,963,226	—246,800,000
	Total of chapter.....	7,378,283,976	6,526,060,750	6,275,940,750	—1,102,343,226	—250,120,000

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Government and Relief in Occupied Areas.—The committee recommends \$11,000,000 for this activity, a reduction of \$1,820,000 in the budget estimate and \$11,500,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1952. The large reduction in the requests for 1953 as compared with 1952, is due primarily to the elimination of funds for Japan. The funds allowed are to provide economic aid, reorientation, and administration costs for the Ryukyus Islands and for expenses of the United States representatives in the Allied Military Government Organization in Trieste. Of the amount allowed, \$1,500,000 is for administration, a reduction of \$645,000 in the amount originally requested.

Language proposed to permit conclusion of certain construction projects by extending the availability of not to exceed \$1,725,000 of funds appropriated for fiscal year 1950, is recommended. The three projects involved are a steam power plant, a road construction program, and a harbor development program at the port of Naha.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Government in Occupied Areas.—The bill includes \$19,000,000 for carrying out United States programs in Germany and Austria. The amount recommended is \$1,500,000 below the budget estimate and \$7,880,000 below the amount provided for fiscal year 1952.

The estimates reflected a decrease from the 1952 appropriation predicated on the termination of occupation activities in Germany and the establishment of the United States mission on an embassy basis. However, the committee feels that the decrease proposed was not commensurate with the reduction in functions and services and recommends a further reduction of \$1,127,500, thus making \$15,572,500 available for Germany.

It should be noted that in addition to the dollar appropriation for Germany, there was requested the equivalent of \$31,133,000 in deutschemarks to be derived from GARIOA counterpart, operating revenues, occupation costs, and surplus property credits.

A breakdown of the Exchange of Persons Program for the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 as compared with the proposed program for 1953 was presented in the budget justifications. The committee was shocked to note that the category "Religious affairs" had been completely eliminated from the program for 1953 although such other categories as "Social services", "Libraries and museums", "Teenagers", etc. were either increased or continued at substantially the same level as 1952. The committee urges that this apparent lack of proper consideration of the importance of religious affairs in international relationships be given prompt attention by the top administrative level.

The situation in Austria remains largely a stalemate. The committee recommends \$3,427,500, a reduction of \$372,500 in the request, for carrying on the activities in that country. In addition to the dollar appropriation request, it was estimated that the equivalent of \$6,211,893 in Austria schillings would be obligated from operating

revenues, reimbursement by MSA, ECA surplus schilling deposits and surplus property credits.

The committee has included language making available, not to exceed \$25,000,000 in surplus property credits for Germany and Austria in the event sufficient currencies are not available from other sources. The committee requests that in future budgets dollar appropriations be requested to cover all expenditures. Dollars will then be used to purchase from the United States Treasury foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States for carrying out the purpose of said appropriation. The unlimited use of foreign currencies and credits owed to or owned by the United States must be discontinued. The limitation placed on the availability of surplus property credits will enable the Department to carry on its estimated use of deuchemarks and schillings to the extent submitted to the committee. The total obligations for each program however, are not to exceed the amounts justified before the committee.

TITLE III—MUTUAL SECURITY

In formulating the authorizing legislation the Mutual Security Program has during this session received the careful consideration of three legislative committees of the Congress and of both the House of Representatives and the Senate. The additional extensive hearings and intensive study by the Committee on Appropriations largely confirms the wisdom of action already taken. However, as a result of the availability of more recent information and a painstaking analysis of financial data related to program operations, the committee has been able to reduce the estimate by \$246,800,000.

It was obvious to the committee from the information furnished to it that the amounts of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for the build-up of our own military force plus the amounts appropriated for military assistance to our allies constitutes a total which, without further curtailment of our civilian production, is beyond our industrial capacity to translate into military goods as rapidly as called for by the schedules upon which the appropriations were based. Faced with this situation the military establishment has given first priority to the fulfillment of its own needs with the result that funds appropriated for military assistance under Mutual Security have neither been obligated nor expended as promptly as planned. The backlog of unfilled needs, for which appropriations had already been made, was taken into consideration in "stretching out" the program when the budget estimates for 1953 were prepared. However, those estimates were based on the premise that obligations and expenditures for the program during the last few months would increase somewhat more than has proven to be the case. On the basis of a careful study of voluminous technical data from the books of the Department of Defense the committee is convinced that a further reduction of \$200,000,000 can be made in the military assistance program without effecting in the slightest degree the orderly scheduling of deliveries necessary to the fulfillment of this program.

The committee has allowed \$1,849,306,250 for all types of economic assistance. The major part of this phase of the program is for "defense support", that type of economic aid which directly results in increased output of military items. Further reductions than those already made in the authorizing legislation would be short-sighted in

that they would very likely result in loss of potential military production worth several times the amount of short-term saving.

The committee was pleased to note that the division of shipping as between foreign and American ships has worked out satisfactorily and in accordance with the intent of the Congress that at least 50 percent of the materials be carried in United States ships as expressed in the authorizing legislation.

The committee notes that the Mutual Security Agency has not included tobacco as an item to be financed. The Agency has indicated that it considers that adequate supplies of leaf tobacco to manufacture products acceptable to consumers are essential to the purposes and objectives of the Mutual Security Program and are necessary to support the defense effort but believes that the requirements for United States tobacco can be financed with dollars from other sources. The committee accepts this explanation but trusts that the Agency will constantly review the tobacco supply situation in the various countries receiving aid under the program and will lend its assistance to see that adequate supplies of tobacco are provided.

There are certain phases of the Mutual Security Program that involve entering into agreements with other countries or groups of countries. Under the Constitution the Executive Branch of the Government has the power to conduct international affairs subject only to ratification by the Senate of any treaties which may be determined upon and subject to the confirmation by the Senate of appointments of ambassadors, ministers, etc. For many years these provisions of the Constitution very definitely limited the role of Congress in international affairs to the matters which could be submitted to the Senate. However, during recent years international arrangements have involved expenditures of large sums of money, a high percentage of which comes out of the Treasury of the United States. Because of the provision in the Constitution which requires that no money be expended out of the Treasury except in consequence of an appropriation made by law, the Congress has a far larger share in international affairs than formerly was the case. In fact, so far as international arrangements and programs are related to expenditure of funds, the power of Congress is exactly the same with respect to international matters as with respect to domestic matters. It must be pointed out that during the past few years the Congress has more than once been confronted with a proposal to expend large sums of money which was based on an agreement entered into by the Executive Branch of the Government and which was stated by the Executive Branch to have been so final in its terms as to be a matter of great embarrassment to the United States should the Congress fail to appropriate the full amount proposed. The Committee on Appropriations does not desire to deny or refuse to meet any real obligation on the part of the United States and the committee has always been careful to recommend appropriations to the Congress when necessary to meet obligations incurred or a just debt.

The Committee on Appropriations desires to state, however, that it will not consider as either morally or legally binding on the United States any agreement with a foreign government involving the expenditure of funds out of the United States Treasury unless an appropriation is legally available to the department or agency of the United

States making said agreement for the purpose at the time the agreement is entered into.

TITLE I—EUROPE

The committee recommends \$4,556,257,750 for this title of which \$3,273,824,750 is for military assistance and \$1,282,433,000 is for defense support. The amount recommended represents a reduction of \$141,800,000 in the budget estimates and a reduction of \$1,218,358.097 below the comparable appropriation for fiscal year 1952.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The \$3,273,824,750 included in this title provides for material and training assistance for the following countries: Belgium-Luxemburg, Denmark, France, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom, and Yugoslavia. In addition, the funds proposed would provide for assistance in equipping forces which might be contributed to the proposed European Defense Community, which would include German contingents, if the pending treaty for Establishment of the European Defense Force is ratified. This appropriation also includes provisions for the United States contribution to the expenses of NATO military and civilian headquarters, the expenses of the Standing Group, the escapee program, and all of the administrative expenses of the Mutual Security Program. The sum of \$43,790,000 was requested for administration. The committee has allowed \$42,000,000, a reduction of \$1,790,000. This compares with an estimated obligation of \$42,031,154 for fiscal year 1952.

The amount recommended for this item is \$141,790,000 below the budget estimate of which \$140,000,000 is to be applied to the military assistance program and the remainder to administration.

ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The committee has approved \$1,282,433,000 for "Defense support" for Europe made up of \$1,247,883,000 for direct "country aid", \$15,500,000 for technical assistance, \$19,000,000 for basic materials development and \$50,000 as a confidential fund. The reduction of \$10,000 made in this title is to correct a typographical error in the budget submission. The following table shows how these funds are programed by country with the comparable 1952 amounts.

United States defense support

[Millions of dollars]

Country	United States defense support	
	Fiscal year 1952	Fiscal year 1953 ¹
10 NATO countries:		
Belgium-Luxemburg.....	² \$8.9	\$0
Denmark.....	23.0	14.0
France.....	270.0	296.0
Iceland.....	5.5	0.7
Italy (including Trieste).....	162.5	³ 77.5
Netherlands.....	100.0	56.4
Norway.....	15.0	7.0
Portugal.....	0	0
United Kingdom.....	⁴ 350.0	⁵ 416.0
Total 10 countries.....	934.9	867.6
Germany (Federal Republic).....	106.0	113.0
Total 10 countries and Germany.....	1,040.9	980.6
Greece.....	182.0	102.283
Turkey.....	70.0	49.0
Total NATO countries and Germany.....	1,292.9	1,131.883
Austria.....	⁶ 120.0	⁶ 61.0
Total 14 countries.....	1,412.9	1,192.883
Yugoslavia.....	80.25	55.0
Total 15 countries.....	1,493.15	1,247.883

¹ These are MSA figures.² Components for military end items exclusively.³ Includes \$12.5 million for POL processed for Greek account.⁴ Includes \$50 million pursuant to the agreement with United Kingdom of July 7, 1950.⁵ Includes \$36 million pursuant to the agreement with United Kingdom of July 7, 1950.⁶ Economic aid.

The committee believes that the expenditure of these funds can easily result in at least twice the amount of military production that could be secured by the expenditure of similar sums for military end items in this country. The committee was presented with many examples to illustrate this point, such as, that \$2,000,000 worth of machine tools enabled the Rolls Royce and DeHaviland aircraft companies to increase their output of jet engines by \$60,000,000 per year and that \$2,000,000 worth of mine machinery made it possible to rehabilitate a Norwegian iron mine, destroyed during the war, which will ship \$7,500,000 of iron ore concentrates to European steel mills this year.

ASSISTANCE TO SPAIN

In connection with the program for assistance to Spain the following testimony was received by the committee.

"The amount of \$100 million contained in the legislation last year has not been spent. We have been engaged in negotiations with the Spanish Government concerning bilateral agreements on the various items by way of bases and other quid pro quos which are to be made available in return for the use of that money, none of which has been obligated, and it is presently expected that none will be obligated in this fiscal year.

As was also testified previously these negotiations are going on, and on the whole give promise of reaching a mutually satisfactory conclusion before too long.

There was added in the authorization legislation this year another \$25 million, as I believe the members of the subcommittee know, so that there will be available by terms of this year's and last year's legislation a total of \$125 million for Spain in addition to a small carry-over of the Export-Import Bank loan funds that were made available, I believe, in the legislation in the fiscal year 1950."

The committee recommends language which continues available until June 30, 1953, the \$100,000,000 appropriation for assistance to Spain granted in the Mutual Security Appropriation Act for 1952. Since the authorizing legislation specifically requires that not less than \$25,000,000 of the funds made available under Title I shall be used for economic, technical, and military assistance to Spain, there will be available at least \$125,000,000 for such assistance during fiscal year 1953.

TITLE II—NEAR EAST AND AFRICA

The bill includes \$711,430,500 for this title of which \$530,316,500 is for Military assistance, \$50,822,750 is for technical cooperation, \$60,063,250 is for Palestine refugees and \$70,228,000 is for Israel refugees. The total amount recommended is \$30,000,000 below the budget estimate and \$158,924,500 over the comparable amount for fiscal year 1952.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The committee recommends \$530,316,500 for this title, a reduction of \$30,000,000 in the budget estimate. These funds are to provide for matériel and training assistance to Greece, Turkey, and Iran. In addition, under the terms of Section 202 of Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, not to exceed 10 percent of the appropriation may be utilized for any other country of the Near East area subject to certain determinations by the President.

ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The bill includes a total of \$181,114,000, the amount of the budget estimate, for the three programs under economic assistance and technical cooperation, title II, namely, Technical cooperation, Palestine refugee program, and Relief and resettlement of refugees entering Israel.

The sum of \$50,822,750 is provided for the technical cooperation program which is a reduction of \$5,433,250 below the 1952 amount.

The following table sets forth the countries, the actual 1951 obligations and those estimated for fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

Comparative summary of obligations by country

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Actual, fiscal year 1951	Estimate, fiscal year 1952	Estimate, fiscal year 1953
Arab States.....	\$557.5	\$12,931	\$21,717
Egypt.....	103.0	670	4,911
Iraq.....	23.4	856	1,276
Jordan.....	132.7	5,070	3,757
Lebanon.....	113.0	3,872	3,974
Saudi Arabia.....	97.2	463	647
Syria.....	88.1	2,000	6,921
Yemen.....			231
Independent Africa.....	992.9	4,430	3,234
Ethiopia (Eritrea).....	50.0	1,238	924
Liberia.....	785.5	1,506	1,155
Libya.....	157.4	1,686	1,155
Iran.....	1,460.4	23,450	23,100
Israel.....	96.3	14,950	2,772
Regional.....	702.7	495	
Total obligations.....	3,809.8	56,256	50,823

The committee has approved the budget estimate of \$60,063,250 for Palestine Refugees (Arabs from Palestine), and \$70,228,000 for Relief and Resettlement of Refugees coming into Israel. The major portion of the appropriation for "Palestine refugees" is to enable the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees to continue with the reestablishment of over 800,000 Arab refugees from Palestine under a 3-year program scheduled to be completed by June 30, 1954. The appropriation for "Refugees coming into Israel" is for direct aid to Israel and is to meet the immediate need for relief and settlement of the tremendous influx of refugees. The alleviation of the refugee problem in the Near East is a major factor in bringing about political and economic stability in this area.

TITLE III—ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

The committee recommends \$862,220,000 for this title of which \$540,807,500 is for military aid and \$321,412,500 for economic and technical assistance. The amount recommended represents a reduction of \$69,000,000 in the budget estimates and a reduction of \$58,322,866 from the comparable appropriation for fiscal year 1952.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The \$540,807,500 is to provide matériel and training to the countries in the general area of China, including Thailand, Indochina, Philippines, and the Nationalist Government of the Republic of China. There is no other area of the world where the immediate need for military strength to ward off Communism is more apparent.

ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The funds for economic and technical assistance under this title are contained in three separate appropriations. The special technical and economic assistance, under the Mutual Security Agency, provides assistance for China (Formosa), Indochina (Associated States), Philippines, and Thailand. The bill includes \$202,778,250, the amount of the budget estimate for the program. The following table sets forth the actual amount of the program by countries for fiscal year 1951 and the estimated obligations for fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

Comparative summary of obligations by country and activity

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Actual, fiscal year 1951	Estimate, fiscal year 1952	Estimate, fiscal year 1953
Special technical and economic assistance:			
China (Formosa).....	¹ \$92,550.0	¹ \$31,000.0	¹ \$100,500.0
Indochina (Associated States).....	21,823.0	24,500.0	² 56,500.0
Philippines.....	15,087.0	32,000.0	28,000.0
Thailand.....	8,932.0	7,000.0	6,200.0
Undistributed by country.....	246.0	150.0	-----
Subtotal.....	138,638.0	144,650.0	191,200.0
Basic materials development (undistributed).....			11,578.3
Total obligations.....	138,638.0	144,650.0	202,778.3

¹ Includes direct military support (common-use items) as follows: Fiscal year 1951, \$12,500,000; fiscal year 1952, \$12,725,000; fiscal year 1953, \$30,500,000.

² Includes \$30,500,000 for direct military support (common-use items).

The amount of the budget estimate, \$118,634,250 is included for the technical cooperation program, under the State Department, which provide bilateral technical cooperation for eight countries.

The following table sets forth the countries, the actual obligations for 1951, and those estimated for fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

Comparative summary of obligations by country and activity

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Actual, fiscal year 1951	Estimate, fiscal year 1952	Estimate, fiscal year 1953
Bilateral technical cooperation:			
Afghanistan.....	\$64.1	\$309.2	\$539.2
Burma.....	10,784.0	14,000.0	12,133.0
Ceylon.....	35.2	18.2	303.0
India.....	5,193.8	54,565.0	77,517.0
Indonesia.....	7,975.0	8,000.0	5,392.0
Malaya.....	1.4		
Nepal.....	35.1	116.6	169.0
Pakistan.....	448.6	10,778.0	22,581.0
Regional.....	65.5	6.0	
Total obligations.....	24,602.7	87,793.0	118,634.2

Also included in title III is the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, for which an additional appropriation of \$45,000,000 was requested. The committee has disallowed the request, but has included language which will continue available the estimated unobligated balance of \$41,500,000 as of June 30. It was testified that this agency will not assume full responsibility for relief and rehabilitation in Korea until 6 months after cessation of hostilities.

TITLE IV—AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The committee recommends \$72,014,750 for this title of which \$51,685,750 is for military aid and \$20,329,000 for technical cooperation. The amount recommended represents a reduction of \$6,000,000 in the budget estimates and an increase of \$16,019,097 over the comparable appropriation for fiscal year 1952.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The \$51,685,750 included in this title is largely to provide spare parts for equipment already on hand and training assistance both in the United States and the recipient Latin American countries.

ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The bill includes \$20,329,000, the amount of the budget estimate for technical cooperation programs for Latin America. This amount provides for a slight expansion of the programs being carried out during the fiscal year 1952.

The following table furnished the committee sets forth the countries participating and the estimated amount for each.

Comparative summary of obligations by country

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Actual, fiscal year 1951	Estimate, fiscal year 1952	Estimate, fiscal year 1953
Bolivia.....	\$502.8	\$1,495.0	\$1,356.0
Brazil.....	1,319.3	2,740.0	3,852.0
Chile.....	433.3	1,321.0	1,143.0
Colombia.....	298.7	781.0	773.0
Costa Rica.....	524.8	1,364.0	1,087.0
Cuba.....	67.6	182.0	257.0
Dominican Republic.....	123.2	287.0	316.0
Ecuador.....	577.3	1,407.0	1,276.0
El Salvador.....	215.1	587.0	709.0
Guatemala.....	274.0	229.0	219.0
Haiti.....	544.9	797.0	720.0
Honduras.....	271.0	712.0	794.0
Mexico.....	406.9	891.0	1,046.0
Nicaragua.....	221.4	669.0	840.0
Panama.....	451.2	1,004.0	993.0
Paraguay.....	678.4	1,676.0	1,121.0
Peru.....	1,417.8	1,874.0	1,966.0
Uruguay.....	186.9	436.0	495.0
Venezuela.....	200.2	156.0	159.0
Regional projects.....	656.8	1,253.0	1,207.0
Total obligation.....	9,371.6	19,861.0	20,329.0

TITLE V

MOVEMENT OF MIGRANTS

The bill includes \$9,240,500, the amount of the budget estimate for this program, the intent of which is to facilitate the movement of surplus manpower from certain countries of Europe to other countries where such manpower can be utilized. The program for 1953 calls for the movement of 140,000 migrants as compared with the planned movement of 137,500 in 1952.

OCEAN FREIGHT VOLUNTARY RELIEF PACKAGES

The sum of \$2,587,500 the amount of the budget estimate, is included in the bill for payment of ocean transportation on relief supplies and packages in the following categories: relief supplies and packages shipped by voluntary nonprofit relief agencies, parcel post packages, and packages shipped by commercial freight.

MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

The bill includes \$15,708,750 for contributions authorized by section 404 (b) of the Act for International Development, as amended by section 10 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1952.

The following table sets forth the amounts for the program by area and agency,

United Nations and specialized agencies by geographic region, 1953 estimates

Agency	Title I, Europe	Title II, Near East and Africa	Title III		Title IV, American Republics	Total
			South Asia	Pacific		
Food and Agriculture Organization...	\$427,000	\$2,462,000	\$1,144,000	\$1,030,000	\$1,737,000	\$6,800,000
International Civil Aviation Organi- zation.....	33,000	361,000	173,000	155,000	79,000	801,000
International Labor Organization.....	298,000	618,000	579,000	521,000	614,000	2,630,000
International Telecommunications Union.....		72,000	75,000	68,000	46,000	261,000
United Nations.....	168,000	1,171,000	887,000	799,000	2,351,000	5,376,000
United Nations Educational, Seienti- fic and Cultural Organization.....	117,000	823,000	822,000	740,000	751,000	3,253,000
World Health Organization.....	183,000	2,082,000	841,000	757,000	1,269,000	5,132,000
World Meteorological Organization.....		72,000	75,000	68,000	46,000	261,000
Total.....	1,226,000	7,661,000	4,596,000	4,138,000	6,893,000	24,514,000
United States share.....						14,708,750
Organization of American States.....					1,000,000	1,000,000
Total obligations.....						15,708,750

CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

The bill includes \$16,481,000, the amount of the budget estimate, to enable the President to make contributions to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) as authorized by section 12 the Mutual Security Act of 1952.

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

H. Doc. No.	Agency and item	Appropriation, 1952 ¹	Estimates, 1953	Recommended in this bill	Bill compared with	
					Appropriations, 1952	Estimates, 1953
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS					
285	Government and Relief in Occupied Areas-----	\$22,500,000	\$12,820,000	\$11,000,000	—\$11,500,000	—\$1,820,000
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
285	Government in Occupied Areas-----	26,880,000	20,500,000	19,000,000	—7,880,000	—1,500,000
510} 512}	MUTUAL SECURITY					
	TITLE I—EUROPE					
	Military Assistance-----	4,165,542,957	3,415,614,750	3,273,824,750	—891,718,207	—141,790,000
	Economic and Technical Assistance-----	1,509,072,890	1,282,443,000	1,282,433,000	—226,639,890	—10,000
	Assistance to Spain-----	100,000,000	(²)	(²)	—100,000,000	-----
	TITLE II—NEAR EAST AND AFRICA					
	Military Assistance-----	396,250,000	560,316,500	530,316,500	+134,066,500	—30,000,000
	Technical Cooperation-----	56,256,000	50,822,750	50,822,750	—5,433,250	-----
	Palestine Refugees-----	50,000,000	60,063,250	60,063,250	+10,063,250	-----
	Israel Refugees-----	50,000,000	70,228,000	70,228,000	+20,228,000	-----

TITLE III—ASIA AND PACIFIC					
Military Assistance-----	688, 444, 000	564, 807, 500	540, 807, 500	-147, 636, 500	-24, 000, 000
Economic Assistance (MSA)-----	144, 305, 866	202, 778, 250	202, 778, 250	+58, 472, 384	-----
Technical Cooperation (TCA)-----	87, 793, 000	118, 634, 250	118, 634, 250	+30, 841, 250	-----
Contributions to United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency-----	-----	45, 000, 000	-----	-----	-45, 000, 000
TITLE IV—AMERICAN REPUBLICS					
Military Assistance-----	38, 150, 000	57, 685, 750	51, 685, 750	+13, 535, 750	-6, 000, 000
Technical Cooperation-----	17, 845, 653	20, 329, 000	20, 329, 000	+2, 483, 347	-----
TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
Movement of Migrants-----	10, 000, 000	9, 240, 500	9, 240, 500	-759, 500	-----
Ocean Freight—Voluntary Relief Packages-----	2, 843, 610	2, 587, 500	2, 587, 500	-256, 110	-----
Multilateral Technical Cooperation-----	12, 400, 000	15, 708, 750	15, 708, 750	+3, 308, 750	-----
Contributions to United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund-----	-----	16, 481, 000	16, 481, 000	+16, 481, 000	-----
Subtotal, Mutual Security-----	7,328,903,976	3 6,492,740,750	3 6,245,940,750	-1,082,963,226	-246,800,000
Total, Chapter IX-----	7,378,283,976	6,526,060,750	6,275,940,750	-1,102,343,226	-250,120,000

¹ For Mutual Security, 1952 appropriations are shown as adjusted for comparability to 1953 appropriation structure.

² Not less than \$25,000,000 of title I made available plus unobligated balance of \$100,000,000.

³ In addition, authority to continue available unobligated balances of prior years funds, estimated by agencies at \$539,511,223 at the time of budget submission but now estimated to be \$809,865,882.

CHAPTER X

EMERGENCY AGENCIES

SUBCOMMITTEE

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

ALBERT THOMAS, Texas
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
JOHN J. ROONEY, New York
JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island

JOHN TABER, New York
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire ¹
GERALD R. FORD, JR., Michigan ¹

¹ Temporarily assigned.

EXPENSES OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The committee considered estimates in the amount of \$173,360,000, as contained in House Document 504 for defense production and stabilization activities. Of this total amount \$103,250,000 was requested for the Economic Stabilization Agency. Due to the present state of indecision as to the status this agency will actually assume in fiscal year 1953 no action has been taken on these estimates. Following the same line of thought no action has been taken on the estimate of the General Services Administration which includes the rental of space for ESA. Funds are recommended in the bill in the amount of \$44,190,000 for the defense production activities of the other agencies involved, a reduction of \$17,420,000 in the budget estimates.

The reductions recommended by the committee are based generally on two criteria, first that substantial progress has been made in the mobilization program and second, that existing governmental personnel and services are not being utilized to the maximum called for by the defense program.

The primary objective of the defense production agencies was the establishment of an industrial base that would supply the expanded military needs of the nation. As has been stated this mobilization base is well on its way to completion. In this connection the Director of Defense Mobilization, in his fifth quarterly report to the President stated, "The time has now arrived when most of the capacity needed for our current programs is either in place or in sight". The controlled materials plan is in operation. It was testified that a significant start has been made toward removing and relaxing controls. The extent of the loan and tax amortization programs appears to be diminishing. In view of the progress that has been made in this respect the committee believes that the final objectives of the program can be reached with considerably less personnel and at less expense than is contemplated in the Budget estimates submitted to the Congress.

Congress in passing the Defense Production Act of 1950 and in making subsequent appropriations available for its implementation envisaged that the executive branch wherever possible would use the existing governmental structure and personnel in furthering those

activities essential to the defense effort. That this has not been done is borne out by the 26,832 permanent positions requested for the defense activities in fiscal year 1953. The committee reiterates the position it took in reporting the bill containing appropriations for these agencies in fiscal year 1952. There must be more positive determination on the part of the Bureau of the Budget and the regularly established agencies of the Government to put aside non-defense matters and to channel their normal activities to those services designed to further the defense effort now being made by the people of this country. To this end the bill again includes a provision directing the transfer of funds from regular to defense activities in the established departments. The committee will expect that the agencies of the executive branch will take a more realistic view of their role in the defense effort by a greater utilization of their regular personnel and resources than was true in fiscal year 1952.

The committee is disappointed in the apparent lack of effective over-all management and personnel programs in the defense agencies. This is especially true in the Economic Stabilization Agency and its constituent offices. In the Office of Price Stabilization considerable overstaffing resulted when a staffing pattern was developed with little regard for the amount of actual work to be performed. Testimony before the committee disclosed that little has been done to date to correct this error. The result of such practices can only be an increase in the financial burden of the Government. Those in charge of these matters in the executive branch must realize that neither the formation of temporary agencies nor the addition of new functions to established ones are licenses to hire personnel and expend funds without regard for proper economy.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

The amount of \$1,000,000 is recommended for this agency, a reduction of \$550,000 in the budget estimate of \$1,550,000. The committee has not allowed the funds requested in the amount of \$145,000 to reimburse the National Security Resources Board for administrative services performed for ODM. These costs were borne by the NSRB in 1952 and this policy should be continued in the coming fiscal year.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The reduction of \$16,870,000 recommended for the agencies engaged chiefly in the production portion of the mobilization effort are generally based on the factors mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The committee desires, however, to point out in more specific detail the activities of several individual departments.

Defense Production Administration.—Funds in the amount of \$2,750,000 are approved for this agency, a reduction of \$750,000 in the budget estimates. The functions of DPA and the National Production Authority are similar in many instances. The chief difference being the detailed operational activities of NPA. For the major portion of the current fiscal year they have operated under one head. Although some progress has been made in the integration of the two offices it seems obvious that much more can be done with resultant savings that should have been achieved in the present fiscal

year. The committee hopes that further integration will become an actuality in the near future.

Department of Commerce.—The defense activities of this Department are divided among seven offices including the National Production Authority. Funds are recommended in the amount of \$25,000,000, a reduction of \$10,000,000. Many of the activities for which funds were requested, especially those of the Industry Evaluation Board, Office of International Trade, Office of Transportation and the Office of Industry and Commerce, appear to have no part in the defense program or are duplication at least in part of functions of other agencies.

The National Production Authority is the chief defense activity of the Department of Commerce. The Office of Field Service has the responsibility of operating the field offices of NPA while the Office of the Secretary, supplies necessary printing, distribution, and administrative services to NPA. With the aforementioned reduction in the workload of these agencies and a closer integration of DPA and NPA activities the funds recommended should prove sufficient to carry out the defense programs of this agency in a realistic manner.

No part of the funds approved are to be used by the Office of the Secretary to provide other than printing and distribution services to NPA. Adequate regular funds exist to provide the necessary administrative services for which this office is responsible.

Defense Transport Administration.—This agency is faced with the task of mobilizing and coordinating the transportation, warehousing and port facilities of the Nation in this continuing production and mobilization effort. That it has made substantial progress toward the fulfillment of this task is pointed out by the alleviation of the freight-car shortage that faced the Nation only a year ago. Such progress as this indicates that the workload of this agency should decline appreciably in the coming fiscal year. This factor and a belief that the Interstate Commerce Commission can absorb a great deal of the DTA work within its regular appropriations leads the committee to believe that the recommended amount of \$2,200,000 should prove adequate.

Department of Agriculture.—Although the committee has specifically denied the request of the department to transfer section 32 funds to defense activities, the funds recommended in the amount of \$2,000,000 are adequate if this agency will utilize its regular services to a larger degree than is presently anticipated. The amount recommended includes \$75,000 for preparation of data on farm wages, farm supply, and requirements by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The results of these studies will be extremely useful to those who are assisting the farmer to meet his manpower requirements.

Department of Labor.—In allowing \$1,750,000 for the Department of Labor the committee has allowed the full amounts of the budget estimate, \$584,000 and \$214,000, respectively, for the Bureau of Apprenticeship and the Bureau of Labor Standards. It is obvious that the continued development of skilled manpower through the training program of the Bureau of Apprenticeship is essential if we are to provide the trained personnel necessary to effectively utilize the defense production facilities now being constructed.

In contrast to the duplication of accident-prevention work in the mobilization effort in World War II such activities are now vested solely in the Bureau of Labor Standards. The proper administration of this program will result not only in monetary and manpower savings but in greatly increased production at little cost to the Federal Government.

Small Defense Plants Administration.—Funds are approved in the amount of \$3,500,000 for the salaries and expenses of this agency. If the efforts of the Government to assist small business are to be successful and at the same time economical a thorough study of the small business activities of other Federal agencies must be made by the proper authorities to insure that no duplication exists and that the intent of the authorizing act as regards transfer of funds and functions to SDPA are carried out to a greater degree than has been true in the past.

The estimate of \$5,000,000 for a revolving fund to be used by this agency in the purchase of prime contracts is approved in the amount of \$3,000,000.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

The amount of \$37,500,000 is recommended for the Federal Civil Defense Administration, a reduction of \$562,500,000 in the budget estimates.

The funds recommended represent continued implementation of the concept of civil defense envisaged by the committee and the Congress in making appropriations for this agency in the past two fiscal years. This concept has as its basis the development of adequate attack warning and communication systems, and the training and education of the American people in matters of self protection. The continued development of this program together with the proper coordination of the civil defense programs of the various states should provide a realistic civil defense plan without the expenditure of large sums of money.

Operations.—Funds are recommended in the amount of \$8,000,000 for this item, a reduction of \$24,000,000 in the budget estimate.

The committee's action on the several activities are as follows:

Attack warning system.....	\$300, 000
Communications.....	1, 200, 000
Supply Services.....	800, 000
Training.....	1, 400, 000
Technical guidance.....	1, 300, 000
Health and special weapons defense.....	400, 000
Public information.....	1, 600, 000
Executive direction.....	1, 000, 000

Funds requested in the amount of \$3,060,000 for research were not allowed in the belief that the major portion of the proposed program represents duplication of work being done by other federal agencies.

The committee is deeply concerned with the apparent desire of this agency to build up a large superstructure of high-salaried permanent positions. It will be expected that in applying the reductions effected the agency will bring its staffing pattern in line with reasonable classification practices.

Federal Contributions.—The amount of \$29,500,000 is recommended for this item to be allotted to the several activities as follows:

Attack warning system.....	\$3, 000, 000
Communications system.....	1, 500, 000
Medical supplies and equipment.....	25, 000, 000

Funds contained under this heading are available to the several states on a matching basis. The committee has denied the funds requested for fire-fighting, rescue and training services in belief that they are properly charges to be borne solely by the state and local governments.

The budget estimates contain \$193,000,000 for the purchase of medical supplies and equipment, a wholly federal charge. As of May 31, 1952 none of the \$50,000,000 appropriated for this item in 1952 had been expended. An expenditure of only \$39,568 is estimated for the entire fiscal year 1952. This merely accentuates the fact that although Congress has made funds available for medical stockpiling few, if any, deliveries of the needed supplies and equipment have actually been made. At the same time the current value of medical stockpiles in other federal agencies is estimated as approximately \$400,000,000. It would appear to the committee that sufficient funds remain available to the Civil Defense Administration to build up its stockpiles in fiscal year 1953. The request is accordingly denied and \$25,000,000 made available to be equally matched by the states and to be used to build up their own stockpiles of medical supplies and equipment.

Emergency supplies.—Funds requested in this item are for Federal purchases of supplies and equipment. In addition to the \$193,000,000 mentioned above the amount of \$50,000,000 was requested for purchasing engineering and welfare supplies. The need for such supplies and services is purely local and is therefore properly chargeable to the local government. The request is accordingly denied.

Protective facilities.—The committee has again denied the request of \$250,000,000 for the initiation of a shelter program. The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 makes funds for such a program available only on a matching basis. Testimony before the committee disclosed that the entire amount of funds made available by the local governments specifically for this purpose is represented in the \$28,500,000 appropriated by the State and city of New York. It appears that the real need in this program is not a vast outlay of Federal funds but rather the continued development of shelter programs in the several States. Such programs are based on surveys now being conducted at non-Federal expense by local agencies to determine the availability of existing shelters and the possibility of strengthening them to conform to the needs of the area.

Procurement fund.—The amount of \$25,000,000 requested for this revolving fund has been denied. The committee has inserted language in the bill which will make the \$5,000,000 appropriated to date for this item available in 1953 and without regard to fiscal year limitations. This should be adequate to meet the needs of this agency in this respect.

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
504	EMERGENCY AGENCIES			
	DEFENSE PRODUCTION			
	Office of Defense Mobilization.....	\$1, 550, 000	\$1, 000, 000	—\$550, 000
	Defense Production Administration.....	3, 500, 000	2, 750, 000	—750, 000
	Defense Transport Administration.....	2, 500, 000	2, 200, 000	—300, 000
	Economic Stabilization Agency.....	¹ 103, 250, 000	-----	-----
	Small Defense Plants Administration:			
	Salaries and expenses.....	4, 200, 000	3, 500, 000	—700, 000
	Revolving fund.....	5, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	—2, 000, 000
	Federal Security Agency.....	545, 000	400, 000	—145, 000
	General Services Administration.....	¹ 8, 500, 000	-----	-----
	Department of Agriculture.....	3, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	—1, 000, 000
	Department of Commerce.....	35, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	—10, 000, 000
	Department of the Interior.....	4, 000, 000	2, 500, 000	—1, 500, 000
	Department of Justice.....	215, 000	90, 000	—125, 000
	Department of Labor.....	2, 100, 000	1, 750, 000	—350, 000
	Total, defense production activities.....	61, 610, 000	44, 190, 000	—17, 420, 000

¹ Recommendations will be made in the form of committee amendments.

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
285	EMERGENCY AGENCIES—Continued			
	FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION			
	Operations-----	\$32, 000, 000	\$8, 000, 000	\$--24, 000, 000
	Federal contributions-----	50, 000, 000	29, 500, 000	--20, 500, 000
	Emergency supplies and equipment-----	243, 000, 000	-----	--243, 000, 000
	Protective facilities-----	250, 000, 000	-----	--250, 000, 000
	Civil defense procurement fund-----	25, 000, 000	-----	--25, 000, 000
	Total, Civil Defense Administration-----	600, 000, 000	37, 500, 000	--562, 500, 000
	Total, Chapter X-----	661, 610, 000	81, 690, 000	--579, 920, 000

CHAPTER XI

CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

The committee has considered estimates contained in House Document No. 517 and Senate Document 144 and has approved the requests as submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. The appropriation of \$5,621,463 for payment of final determinations of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission is recommended with the understanding that individual payments to be made will be final and in full settlement of each original claim.

CHAPTER XII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina, *Chairman*

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri
LOUIS RABAUT, Michigan

GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
GERALD R. FORD, JR., Michigan

The general provisions included in this bill cover all agencies and corporations of the Federal Government in practically the same manner as they did a year ago in the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1952 and in most cases are substantially the same as those which were carried in that bill.

Section 1201 continues, at \$1,400 each, the limitation on the amount that may be spent for purchase of passenger motor vehicles. This is the same figure that is carried in the 1952 Act.

Section 1202 continues language which has been carried for some time concerning the employment of aliens.

Section 1203 continues language previously carried relating to living quarters allowances.

Section 1204 continues language previously carried prohibiting the filling of positions by anyone whose nomination has been disapproved by the Senate.

Section 1205 continues language previously carried limiting the amount that may be paid for copies of the United States Code Annotated.

Section 1206 continues language previously carried relating to the use of funds by Government corporations.

Section 1207 continues language previously carried prohibiting the use of funds of corporations for purchase or construction of office buildings at the seat of Government.

Section 1208 continues language previously carried commonly known as the anti-strike provision.

Section 1209 continues language previously carried concerning payments to retired officers who may be conducting negotiations with the Government.

Section 1210 continues, and makes permanent, language previously carried authorizing the use of appropriated funds for payment of taxes where the United States is an employer as defined by the provisions of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950.

Section 1211 continues language previously carried to authorize the transfer of personnel and appropriations to defense activities of various departments and agencies of the Government in pursuance of law.

Section 1212 prohibits the use of funds in this Act to pay employees at rates in excess of that provided in the regular 1953 appropriation acts. This is similar to a provision in last year's bill.

Section 1213 carries new language concerning rental of Government-owned living quarters. This language incorporates, by reference, Bureau of the Budget Circular A-45 and is recommended by the committee in order to establish a more uniform and equitable handling of the rental problem. The language in this section provides that a report on its operations shall be made to Congress early in the 83rd Congress at which time the Committee can give the matter further consideration and make a redetermination as to the proper steps that should be taken.

Section 1214 contains language validating obligations incurred by the various departments and agencies whose bills have not been finally approved by July 1, 1952. This will cover the period from July 1, 1952, to the date of enactment of the various Acts.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 11, in connection with extraordinary alterations and repairs, executive mansion:

** * *, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act.*

On pages 11 and 12, in connection with plant and equipment, Atomic Energy Commission:

Provided, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding twenty-five years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs provided in the contracts, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

On page 12, in connection with hospital facilities in the District of Columbia, General Services Administration:

Provided further, That appropriations and contract authorizations heretofore granted under the head of "Hospital Center, District of Columbia" shall be merged with and accounted for as a part of this appropriation.

On page 13, in connection with defense housing, Office of the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency:

Provided, That the funds hereby appropriated shall not be available in excess of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for defense housing by title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951

On pages 13 and 14, in connection with administrative expenses, Federal National Mortgage Association:

Provided, That this paragraph shall take effect only upon the enactment into law of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress.

On page 14, in connection with Alaska Housing:

Provided, That this paragraph shall take effect only upon the enactment into law of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress.

On page 27, in connection with Government in Occupied Areas:

and (4), in the event sufficient currencies are not available from the sources specified in (1), (2), and (3) above, currencies derived from payments by the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Austria to the Government of the United States for surplus property of whatever nature and kind heretofore made available to Germany and Austria, in an amount not to exceed the equivalent of \$25,000,000; however, the foregoing limitation shall not apply to currencies utilized hereunder for United States assistance to Berlin:

On page 48, in connection with General Provisions of Chapter XII:

SEC. 1213. During the current fiscal year, the provisions of Bureau of the Budget Circular A-45, dated June 3, 1952, shall be controlling over the activities of all departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government: Provided, That said circular may be amended or changed during such year by the Director of the Budget with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives: Provided further, That the Bureau of the Budget shall make a report to Congress not later than January 31, 1953, of the operations of this order upon all departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government: Provided further, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law no officer or employee shall be required to occupy any Government-owned quarters unless the head of the agency concerned shall determine that necessary service cannot be rendered or property of the United States cannot be adequately protected otherwise.



82^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 8370

[Report No. 2316]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 26, 1952

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply sup-
5 plemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1953, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FISCAL SERVICE

10 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Salaries
11 and expenses, Fiscal Service", \$70,000.

1 COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT FUND EXPENSES

2 DISTRICT GOVERNMENT RETIREMENT AND RELIEF FUNDS

3 For an additional amount for "District government re-
4 tirement and relief funds", \$397,000.

5 DISTRICT DEBT SERVICE

6 For reimbursement to the Treasury of the United States
7 for the amount paid to the Pan American Union under the
8 provisions of Public Law 902, approved December 29, 1950,
9 \$54,692.

10 REGULATORY AGENCIES

11 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses for "Office of Administrator of
14 Rent Control", \$125,000, of which not less than \$27,000
15 shall be available for payment of terminal leave only: *Pro-*
16 *vided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon
17 enactment into law of authorizing legislation for the purposes
18 of rent control in the District of Columbia.

19 PUBLIC SCHOOLS

20 OPERATING EXPENSES

21 PUBLIC SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES FUND

22 For crediting to the public school food services fund,
23 in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia
24 Public School Food Services Act (Public Law 159, ap-
25 proved October 8, 1951), \$25,000.

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil Defense, including personal services without reference to the civil service laws as related to recruitment; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$100,000.

REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

For payment of per diem for the fiscal year 1952 of members of the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia, \$5,020: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for the payment of such per diem for services rendered prior to July 1, 1950.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MEDICAL CHARITIES

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "Medical charities", \$92,613.

PUBLIC WORKS

OPERATING EXPENSES, ELECTRICAL DIVISION

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1951, for "Operating expenses, Electrical Division", \$19,341.

REPAIRS TO OLD BAY LINE PIER

For emergency repairs to Old Bay Line pier, Washington Channel, \$26,700, which amount shall be transferred to the Department of the Army and be expended under the

1 direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision
2 of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until
3 expended.

4 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

5 The sums appropriated in this Act for the District of
6 Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for,
7 be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia,
8 as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts
9 for the fiscal years involved.

10 CHAPTER II

11 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

12 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

13 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

14 Stationery (revolving fund) : For an additional amount
15 for "Stationery (revolving fund)", \$132,200, including an
16 additional stationery allowance of \$300 for each Repre-
17 sentative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from
18 Puerto Rico, for the second session of the Eighty-second
19 Congress, to remain available until expended.

20 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

21 For an additional amount for "House Office Buildings",
22 including structural and mechanical changes, \$71,750.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport Act", \$585,536, as follows: Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia, \$51,797; Municipal Airport, Hutchinson, Kansas, \$43,961; Salisbury-Wicomico Airport, Salisbury, Maryland, \$25,096; Holman Field, St. Paul, Minnesota, \$174,327; Municipal Airport, Dayton, Ohio, \$289,294; Kitsap County Airport, Kitsap, Washington, \$1,061.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

EMERGENCY FACILITIES, RADIATION PHYSICS LABORATORY

For expenses necessary for construction of a Radium Laboratory and an annex to the Betatron Building, \$131,000.

CHAPTER IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", \$4,500,000.

1 ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

2 For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction,
3 and improvements", \$5,000,000, to remain available until
4 expended.

5 RETIRED PAY

6 For an additional amount for "Retired pay", \$600,000.

7 RESERVE TRAINING

8 For an additional amount for "Reserve training",
9 \$100,000.

10 GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

11 RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

12 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

13 Not to exceed \$15,500,000 (to be computed on an
14 accrual basis) of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance
15 Corporation shall be available during the current fiscal year
16 for its administrative expenses, including hire of passenger
17 motor vehicles; and use of the services and facilities of the
18 Federal Reserve banks: *Provided*, That as used herein the
19 term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to include
20 all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract or
21 fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the pur-
22 chase of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices:
23 *Provided further*, That the limiting amount heretofore stated
24 for administrative expenses shall be increased by an amount

1 which does not exceed the aggregate cost of salaries, wages,
 2 travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside the
 3 continental United States; the expenses of services per-
 4 formed on a contract or fee basis in connection with termi-
 5 nation of contracts or in the performance of legal services;
 6 and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other
 7 Government agencies: *Provided further*, That the distribu-
 8 tion of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Cor-
 9 poration shall be made in accordance with generally recog-
 10 nized accounting principles and practices.

11 CHAPTER V

12 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

13 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

14 Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount
 15 which may be expended for one passenger motor vehicle
 16 (for replacement only) carried under this head in the
 17 Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby
 18 increased from "\$3,000" to "\$5,000".

19 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

20 GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

21 AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

22 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for
 23 unemployment compensation and employment service admin-
 24 istration", \$6,800,000.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Salaries and expenses: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), including temporary employment of persons without regard to the civil service laws, \$2,800,000: *Provided*, That the general provisions applicable to the Department of Labor contained in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, shall apply to the funds appropriated herein in the same manner as if this appropriation were a part of that Act.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

For an additional amount for "Education of the Blind", \$60,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$60,000.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For additional amounts for increased costs of pay and allowances authorized by Public Law 346, approved May 19, 1952, as follows:

"Venereal diseases", \$16,500;

“Tuberculosis”, \$23,250;

“Assistance to States, general”, \$37,500;

“Communicable diseases”, \$69,750;

“Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene”,
\$61,500;

“Disease and sanitation investigations and control,
Territory of Alaska”, \$7,500;

“Salaries and expenses, hospital construction serv-
ices”, \$9,000;

“Hospitals and medical care”, \$388,000;

“Foreign quarantine service”, \$15,000;

“National Institutes of Health, operating expenses”,
\$48,750;

“National Cancer Institute”, \$25,500;

“Mental health activities”, \$16,500;

“National Heart Institute”, \$22,500;

“Dental health activities”, \$20,250;

“Retired pay of commissioned officers”, \$36,000;

“Salaries and expenses”, \$20,250.

HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for “Hospitals and medical
care” \$500,000; and this amount shall be exclusively avail-
able for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and
treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE COMMUNITY

FACILITIES AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Defense Community Facilities and Services", \$50,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Defense Community Facilities and Services, Federal Security Agency": *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this head shall be obligated after December 31, 1952 except for liquidation of the program.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$525,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That restrictions contained within the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952, limiting the amounts which may be expended from appropriations to the National Park Service for personal services, are hereby waived to the extent necessary to meet the costs of fire suppression and of emergency reconstruction or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes.

CHAPTER VII

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

EXTRAORDINARY ALTERATIONS AND REPAIRS, EXECUTIVE
MANSION

Not to exceed \$50,000 of funds made available to the President under the heading "Emergency Fund for the President, National Defense", contained in the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953", shall be available until June 30, 1954, for extraordinary alterations, repairs, furniture, and furnishings of the Executive Mansion and the White House Office, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

DEDICATION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIALS

For expenses necessary for an appropriate dedication of World War II memorials, erected under authority of the Act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 123), to be available for such purposes as the Commission may deem necessary and proper and without regard to the provisions of other laws or regulations relating to the expenditure of public funds (except that this exemption shall not be construed as

1 waiving the requirement for the submission of accounts and
2 vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit), \$30,-
3 000, to be immediately available and to remain available
4 until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That, when in the discretion
5 of the American Battle Monuments Commission it would
6 be in the public interest, personnel and transportation facili-
7 ties of any other Government agency may be furnished by
8 such agency, without reimbursement, to the Commission
9 for the purposes of this appropriation.

10 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

11 Operating expenses: For an additional amount for "Op-
12 erating expenses", including the hire of passenger motor
13 vehicles, \$35,000,000, of which \$30,000,000 shall be avail-
14 able only for the weapons program: *Provided*, That appro-
15 priations granted to the Commission under this head for the
16 fiscal year 1953 shall be available in amounts not to exceed
17 \$25,064,275 for expenses of program direction and adminis-
18 tration personnel, and not to exceed \$2,709,350 for expenses
19 of travel.

20 Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for
21 "Plant and equipment", including the purchase (not to ex-
22 ceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor
23 vehicles, \$1,450,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with
24 the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the
25 Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of

1 the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify
2 existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for
3 periods not exceeding twenty-five years, and such contracts
4 shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon pay-
5 ment of cancellation costs provided in the contracts, and any
6 appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the
7 Commission shall be available for the payment of such can-
8 cellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the fore-
9 going appropriation shall be available for the construction
10 of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project,
11 unless funds are available for the completion of such build-
12 ing, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

13 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

14 HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

15 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions
16 of the Act approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as
17 amended (65 Stat. 657), authorizing the establishment of a
18 hospital center in the District of Columbia, including grants
19 to private agencies for hospital facilities in said District,
20 \$11,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
21 That the foregoing appropriation shall be the total amount to
22 be provided by the Federal Government for the completion
23 of the projects contemplated in connection with such appro-
24 priation: *Provided further*, That appropriations and con-
25 tract authorizations heretofore granted under the head of

1 "Hospital Center, District of Columbia" shall be merged
2 with and accounted for as a part of this appropriation.

3 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

4 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

5 DEFENSE HOUSING

6 For an additional amount for "Defense housing", includ-
7 ing not to exceed \$1,433,735 for administrative expenses
8 of the Public Housing Administration in connection with
9 construction of housing under such appropriation, \$50,-
10 000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
11 That the funds hereby appropriated shall not be available
12 in excess of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be
13 appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Agency
14 for defense housing by title III of the Defense Housing
15 and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951: *Pro-*
16 *vided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation
17 shall be used for the construction of any project unless funds
18 are available for the completion of such project.

19 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

20 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

21 The amount made available under this head in title III
22 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, for
23 administrative expenses of the Federal National Mortgage
24 Association is increased by \$680,000; and the limitation
25 under said head on the amount available for expenses of

1 travel is increased by \$40,800: *Provided*, That this para-
2 graph shall take effect only upon the enactment into law
3 of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress.

4 ALASKA HOUSING

5 For an additional amount for "Alaska housing",
6 \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
7 That this paragraph shall take effect only upon the enact-
8 ment into law of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress.

9 SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

10 CAPITAL GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN

11 REDEVELOPMENT

12 For payment of capital grants as authorized by title I of
13 the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1453,
14 1456), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

15 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 The amount made available under this head in title III
18 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, for
19 administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administra-
20 tion is increased by \$1,433,735; and the limitation under
21 said head on the amount available for expenses of travel is
22 increased by \$88,000.

23 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

24 For an additional amount for "Tennessee Valley
25 Authority", including the purchase of not to exceed an

1 additional seventy passenger motor vehicles, \$150,000,000,
2 to remain available until expended.

3 WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

4 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

5 For an additional amount for "Administrative expenses",
6 \$100,000, to be derived from the war claims fund created
7 by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public
8 Law 896, approved July 3, 1948).

9 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

10 MARITIME ACTIVITIES

11 WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION LIQUIDATION

12 The appropriation made available under this head in the
13 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, shall be avail-
14 able for the payment of obligations incurred against the work-
15 ing fund titled "Working fund, Commerce, War Shipping
16 Administration functions, December 31, 1946".

17 CHAPTER VIII

18 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

19 TITLE I—MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

20 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

21 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

22 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
23 porary or permanent public works, military installations,
24 and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the Act of
25 January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress),

1 the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
 2 second Congress), and the Act of ———, 1952 (Public
 3 Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), without
 4 regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as
 5 amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and
 6 not to exceed \$5,000,000 for advance planning as authorized
 7 by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; \$600,-
 8 090,000, to remain available until expended.

9 DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

10 PUBLIC WORKS

11 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
 12 porary or permanent public works, naval installations, and
 13 facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the Act of June 16,
 14 1948 (62 Stat. 459), the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public
 15 Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of September 11,
 16 1950 (Public Law 783, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of
 17 January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress),
 18 the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
 19 second Congress), and the Act of ———, 1952 (Public Law —,
 20 H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), seal coating for air-
 21 field pavements at Naval Station, Adak, Alaska; including
 22 not to exceed \$2,500,000 for advance planning as authorized
 23 by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; \$210,000
 24 for the acquisition of facilities as authorized by said Act of

1 September 11, 1950; furniture for public quarters; personnel
2 in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services
3 necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engi-
4 neering and architectural services as authorized by section 3
5 of the Act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556) ; \$386,409,-
6 840, to remain available until expended.

7 DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

8 ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

9 For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment
10 of temporary or permanent public works, military installa-
11 tions, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the
12 Act of March 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 17), the Act of October
13 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 936), as amended, the Act of June 17,
14 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of
15 January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress),
16 the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
17 second Congress), and the Act of ———, 1952 (Public
18 Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), without
19 regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as
20 amended, and the land, and interests therein, may be ac-
21 quired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior
22 to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required
23 by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; not to exceed
24 \$52,620,000 for planning (including advance planning,
25 master planning, and investigational engineering) as au-

1 thorized by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951;
2 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,200,000,000, to
3 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of
4 these funds shall be expended for actual construction of
5 facilities or structures at Grandview Air Terminal, Missouri,
6 until the city of Kansas City, Missouri, has conveyed to the
7 United States Government the fee simple title to all lands
8 required for the base or has given the United States Govern-
9 ment at least a twenty-five-year lease to such land on a
10 nominal rental basis: *Provided further*, That no part of
11 these funds shall be expended (except for planning) in con-
12 nection with the proposed Strategic Air Command installa-
13 tion at Lincoln Municipal Airport, Lincoln, Nebraska.

14 SEC. 802. None of the funds appropriated in this title
15 shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee
16 contract for work where cost estimates exceed \$25,000 to
17 be performed within the continental United States without
18 the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense
19 setting forth the reasons therefor.

20 SEC. 803. None of the funds appropriated in this title
21 shall be expended for additonal costs involved in expedit-
22 ing construction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense,
23 or his designee for the purpose, shall establish a reasonable
24 completion date for each project, taking into consideration
25 the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal

1 conditions affecting the construction and the application of
2 economical construction practices.

3 SEC. 804. No part of the funds made available by this
4 or any other Act of the present Congress shall be used for
5 the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery,
6 laundry, or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its
7 Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of De-
8 fense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons there-
9 for, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are
10 not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates.

11 SEC. 805. This title may be cited as the "Military Pub-
12 lic Works Appropriation Act, 1953".

13 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

14 ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

15 CONSTRUCTION

16 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
17 porary or permanent public works, including buildings, facili-
18 ties, appurtenances, and utilities, at stations of the Alaska
19 Communication System, as authorized by the Act of June
20 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), and the Act of October 27,
21 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136
22 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of
23 passenger motor vehicles; \$1,400,000, to remain available
24 until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
25 not be available for construction of family quarters at (1) an

average cost in excess of \$26,500 for construction, including but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of \$5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services therefor and all contingencies.

CHAPTER IX

MUTUAL SECURITY

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government or occupation of certain foreign areas (except Germany, Japan and Austria), including, subject to such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition, travel expenses, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; translation rights, photographic work, education exhibits, and

1 dissemination of information, including preview and review
2 expenses incident thereto; hire of passenger motor vehicles
3 and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings, utilities,
4 facilities, and appurtenances; not to exceed \$2,000 for con-
5 tingencies for the United States commanders, commissioners,
6 or other administrators of foreign areas, to be expended
7 in their respective discretions; such minimum supplies for
8 the civilian populations of such areas as may be
9 essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prej-
10 udicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; and
11 such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be es-
12 sential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation;
13 \$11,000,000, of which not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be
14 available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the gen-
15 eral provisions of the Appropriation Act for the current fiscal
16 year for the military functions of the Department of the Army
17 shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from
18 this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from
19 this appropriation may be made outside continental United
20 States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without
21 regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised
22 Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or
23 provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a
24 citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That ex-
25 penditures from this appropriation may be made, when

1 necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sec-
2 tion 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed
3 Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151-161) :
4 *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made here-
5 under for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in such
6 occupied areas in such manner as to be consistent with the
7 general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948,
8 as amended, and in the manner authorized by section 111
9 (b) (1) thereof: *Provided further*, That funds appropri-
10 ated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termina-
11 tion of occupation by the United States, of any area for
12 which such funds are made available, may be expended by
13 the President for the procurement of such commodities and
14 technical services, and commodities procured from funds
15 herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief
16 in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior
17 to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized
18 by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the mainte-
19 nance of the political and economic stability of such areas:
20 *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made
21 available, an agreement shall be entered into between the
22 United States and the recognized government or authority
23 with respect to such area containing such undertakings by
24 such government or authority as the President may deter-
25 mine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of

1 such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided*
2 *further*, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include
3 requirements and undertakings corresponding to the re-
4 quirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and
5 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, ap-
6 proved December 17, 1947) : *Provided further*, That funds
7 appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable,
8 and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed
9 by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay
10 ocean transportation charges from United States ports,
11 including territorial ports, to ports in the Ryukyus for the
12 movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United
13 States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with
14 and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary
15 Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals re-
16 siding in such areas: *Provided further*, That under the rules
17 and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department
18 or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per
19 pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of
20 food or other general classification of commodities shipped to
21 the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher
22 rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but
23 this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals
24 to individuals: *Provided further*, That the President may
25 transfer to any other department or agency any function or

1 functions provided for under this appropriation, and there
2 shall be transferred to any such department or agency
3 without reimbursement and without regard to the appro-
4 priation from which procured, such property as the Director
5 of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate pri-
6 marily to any function or functions so transferred: *Provided*
7 *further*, That not to exceed \$1,725,000 of the funds appro-
8 priated under this head for the fiscal year 1950, shall remain
9 available until June 30, 1953, for the payment of obliga-
10 tions incurred under contracts executed prior to July 1,
11 1950.

12 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

13 GOVERNMENT IN OCCUPIED AREAS

14 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
15 meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States
16 in Germany and Austria (including those arising under the
17 supreme authority assumed by the United States on June
18 5, 1945, and under contractual arrangements with the
19 Federal Republic of Germany), under such regulations as
20 the Secretary of State may prescribe, including one deputy
21 to the United States chief of mission in Germany at a salary
22 of \$17,500; tuition, travel expenses, health and accident in-
23 surance, fees incident to instruction in the United States or
24 elsewhere, and hospitalization and medical care, including

1 travel of attendants, of such persons as may be required to
2 carry out the provisions of this appropriation; actual expenses
3 of preparing and transporting to their former homes the re-
4 mains of persons who may die away from their homes while
5 participating in activities authorized under this appropriation;
6 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
7 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per
8 diem for individuals; payment of tort claims, in the manner
9 authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended,
10 of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise
11 in foreign countries; expenses for translation and reproduc-
12 tion rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation, and distribu-
13 tion of educational, informational, reorientation, and rehabili-
14 tation materials and equipment for Germany and Austria,
15 including grants; medical and health assistance for the civilian
16 population of Germany and Austria; expenses incident to the
17 operation of schools for American children who are depend-
18 ents of Government personnel; expenses incident to maintain-
19 ing discipline and order (including trial and punishment by
20 courts established by or under authority of the President);
21 printing and binding outside continental United States with-
22 out regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44
23 U. S. C. 111); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance
24 of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices
25 abroad; purchase (including one at not to exceed \$3,600 for

1 replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;
2 transportation to Germany or Austria of property donated
3 for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen contin-
4 gencies (not to exceed \$25,000) for the United States
5 chief of mission in Germany, to be accounted for pur-
6 suant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes
7 (31 U. S. C. 107) ; and representation allowances (not to
8 exceed \$35,000) similar to those authorized by section 901
9 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C.
10 1131) ; \$19,000,000: *Provided*, That provisions of law,
11 including current appropriation Acts, applicable to the
12 Department of State shall be available for application to
13 expenditures made from this appropriation: *Provided fur-*
14 *ther*, That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932,
15 as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out
16 the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency
17 may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation:
18 *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation
19 may be made outside the continental United States, when
20 necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sec-
21 tions 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Pro-*
22 *vided further*, That the Department of State is authorized
23 to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation,
24 including unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reim-
25 bursement from this or any other appropriation (1)

1 currencies deposited in Germany by the Federal Re-
2 public of Germany and in Austria by the Republic of
3 Austria in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the
4 Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and
5 which may be made available by the Director for
6 Mutual Security, (2) currencies otherwise deposited in
7 Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany and which be-
8 come available for use of the Government of the United
9 States, its representatives or agencies in Germany, in such
10 quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be
11 determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with
12 the Director for Mutual Security, (3) other currencies de-
13 rived from activities carried on under this appropriation,
14 or in the possession of or under the control of the Depart-
15 ment of State in Germany and Austria, and (4), in the event
16 sufficient currencies are not available from the sources speci-
17 fied in (1), (2), and (3) above, currencies derived from
18 payments by the Federal Republic of Germany and the
19 Republic of Austria to the Government of the United States
20 for surplus property of whatever nature and kind heretofore
21 made available to Germany and Austria, in an amount
22 not to exceed the equivalent of \$25,000,000; however,
23 the foregoing limitation shall not apply to currencies
24 utilized hereunder for United States assistance to Ber-
25 lin: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this

1 appropriation appointments may be made to the Foreign
2 Service Reserve without regard to the four-year limita-
3 tion contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service
4 Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That in the event the
5 President assigns to the Department of State responsi-
6 bilities and obligations of the United States in connection
7 with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas
8 in addition to Germany and Austria, the authorities contained
9 in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of
10 State in connection with such government, occupation, or
11 control of such foreign areas: *Provided further*, That when
12 the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act
13 of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes
14 subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the
15 United States Government serving in Germany and Austria,
16 payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the
17 same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department
18 of the Army serving in Germany and Austria, respectively.

19 TITLE III—MUTUAL SECURITY

20 For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry
21 out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Pub-
22 lic Law 165, approved October 10, 1951), as amended, as
23 follows:

24 Military assistance, title I: For assistance authorized by
25 section 101 (a) (1), \$3,273,824,750; and, in addition, un-

1 expended balances of appropriations heretofore made pur-
2 suant to section 101 (a) (1) of said Act shall remain avail-
3 able through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with
4 this appropriation;

5 Economic and technical assistance, title I: For assistance
6 authorized by section 101 (a) (2), \$1,282,433,000; and,
7 in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore
8 made pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of said Act shall
9 remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be con-
10 solidated with this appropriation;

11 Assistance to Spain: Unexpended balances of appropria-
12 tions for "Assistance to Spain", granted in the Mutual Se-
13 curity Appropriation Act of 1952, shall remain available
14 until June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with funds
15 allocated for assistance to Spain pursuant to section 101 (c)
16 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;

17 Military assistance, title II: For assistance authorized
18 by section 201, \$530,316,500; and in addition, unexpended
19 balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to sec-
20 tion 201 of said Act shall remain available through June 30,
21 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

22 Economic and technical assistance, title II: For assist-
23 ance authorized by section 203, \$50,822,750; and, in addi-
24 tion, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made
25 pursuant to section 203 of said Act (except the amounts

1 allocated or available for the purposes of sections 204 and
2 205 of said Act) shall remain available through June 30,
3 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

4 Palestine refugee assistance, title II: For assistance au-
5 thorized by section 206 for carrying out the purposes of
6 section 204 of said Act, \$60,063,250; and, in addition,
7 unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made avail-
8 able pursuant to section 203 and allocated or otherwise
9 available for the purposes of said section 204 shall remain
10 available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated
11 with this appropriation;

12 Relief and resettlement of refugees entering Israel, title
13 II: For assistance authorized by section 206 for carrying out
14 the purposes of section 205 of said Act, \$70,228,000;

15 Military assistance, title III: For assistance authorized
16 by section 301, \$540,807,500; and, in addition, unexpended
17 balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to sec-
18 tion 301 of said Act shall remain available through June 30,
19 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

20 Economic and technical assistance, title III: (a) For
21 assistance authorized by section 302 (a), to be furnished
22 under the applicable provisions of section 503 of the Mutual
23 Security Act of 1952, \$202,778,250; and, in addition,
24 unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made
25 available pursuant to section 302 of said Act and allocated or

1 otherwise available to the Mutual Security Agency (except
2 unexpended balances of funds allocated for assistance to
3 Burma and Indonesia) shall remain available through June
4 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;
5 (b) For assistance authorized by section 302 (a) to be fur-
6 nished under the applicable provisions of the Act for Interna-
7 tional Development, as amended, \$118,634,250; and, in addi-
8 tion, unexpended balances of (1) appropriations heretofore
9 available pursuant to section 302 of said Act and allocated or
10 otherwise available to the Technical Cooperation Administra-
11 tion, and (2) funds allocated for assistance for Burma and
12 Indonesia, shall remain available through June 30, 1953,
13 and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

14 Contributions to United Nations Korean Reconstruction
15 Agency, title III: The unobligated balances of the appro-
16 priations available during the fiscal year 1952 for carrying
17 out section 303 of said Act shall remain available through
18 June 30, 1953;

19 Military assistance, Title IV: For assistance authorized
20 by section 403 to carry out the provisions of section 401 of
21 said Act, \$51,685,750; and, in addition, unexpended bal-
22 ances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said
23 section 401 shall remain available through June 30, 1953,
24 and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

25 Technical assistance, title IV: For assistance authorized

1 by section 403 to carry out the provisions of section 402 of
2 said Act, \$20,329,000; and, in addition, unexpended balances
3 of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said section
4 402 shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and be
5 consolidated with this appropriation;

6 Movement of migrants, title V: For assistance authorized
7 by section 534, \$9,240,500;

8 Ocean freight, voluntary relief packages, title V: For
9 assistance authorized by section 535, \$2,587,500.

10 MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

11 For contributions authorized by section 404 (b) of the
12 Act for International Development, as amended by section
13 10 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, \$15,708,750.

14 CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL

15 CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

16 For contributions authorized by section 12 of the Mutual
17 Security Act of 1952, \$16,481,000.

18 CORPORATION

19 The following corporation is hereby authorized to make
20 such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing
21 authority available to such corporation or agency and in
22 accord with law, and to make such contracts and commit-
23 ments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by
24 section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as
25 amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs

1 set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1953 for such
2 corporation:

3 Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

4 GENERAL PROVISIONS

5 Appropriations in this title for economic or technical
6 assistance and allocations from any appropriations to the
7 Director for Mutual Security, or the Mutual Security Agency,
8 or the Department of State, shall be available, without limi-
9 tation on any authority conferred by the Mutual Security
10 Act of 1951, as amended, or any Act continued in effect
11 thereby, for rents in the District of Columbia; expenses of
12 attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of such
13 appropriations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase
14 of not to exceed two aircraft for use outside the continental
15 limits of the United States and maintenance, operation, and
16 hire of aircraft; purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger
17 motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the
18 United States and, in addition, passenger motor vehicles
19 abroad may be exchanged or sold and replaced for an equal
20 number of such vehicles; transportation of privately owned
21 automobiles; entertainment within the United States (not to
22 exceed \$20,000) ; exchange of funds without regard to sec-
23 tion 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543) ; loss by

1 exchange; expenditures (not to exceed \$50,000) of a con-
2 fidential character other than entertainment provided that a
3 certificate of the amount of each such expenditure, the nature
4 of which it is considered inadvisable to specify, shall be made
5 by the Director or Deputy Director of Mutual Security, and
6 every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for
7 the amount therein specified; insurance of official motor ve-
8 hicles in foreign countries; acquisition of quarters
9 outside the continental limits of the United States to house
10 employees of the United States Government by rental (with-
11 out regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as
12 amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, purchase, or con-
13 struction, and necessary repairs and alterations to such
14 quarters; health and accident insurance for foreign
15 trainees and technicians while en route or absent from
16 their own countries participating in activities author-
17 ized under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;
18 actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former
19 homes in the United States or elsewhere the remains of per-
20 sons or members of the families of persons who may die
21 while such persons are away from their homes participating
22 in activities under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as
23 amended; and services of commissioned officers of the Public

1 Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for
2 the purposes of providing such services the Public Health
3 Service may appoint not to exceed 20 officers in the Regular
4 Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above
5 that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance with
6 section 711 of the Act of July 1, 1944, as amended (42
7 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey may
8 appoint for such purposes not to exceed 20 commissioned
9 officers in addition to those otherwise authorized: *Provided*,
10 That not to exceed \$42,000,000 shall be available
11 for administrative expenses of the departments and
12 agencies concerned with the administration of the programs
13 provided for herein and no part of such amount shall be used
14 to pay the salary of any civilian employee at a rate greater
15 than that paid by the State Department for comparable work
16 or services in the same area: *Provided further*, That agricul-
17 tural products or products produced from agricultural prod-
18 ucts purchased or obtained under this program shall be at
19 not less than the average market price prevailing for such
20 commodity or commodities within the United States or the
21 support price for such commodity or commodities, which-
22 ever is the greater.

1 This chapter may be cited as the “Mutual Security
2 Appropriation Act, 1953”.

3 CHAPTER X

4 EMERGENCY AGENCIES

5 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

6 OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

7 For expenses necessary for the Office of Defense
8 Mobilization, including compensation of the Director of De-
9 fense Mobilization at the rate of \$22,500 per annum; printing
10 and binding without regard to section 89 of the Act of
11 January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U. S. C. 213) ; hire of
12 passenger motor vehicles; reimbursement of the General
13 Services Administration for security guard service; not to
14 exceed \$5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses,
15 to be expended under the direction of the Director for such
16 purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon
17 shall be final and conclusive; and expenses of attendance
18 at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropria-
19 tion; \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That contracts under this appro-
20 priation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized
21 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
22 55a), may be renewed annually.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for the Defense Production Administration, including employment of aliens, reimbursement of General Services Administration for security guard services, and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$2,750,000: *Provided*, That transfers (not to exceed 10 per centum) between the appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Defense Production Administration" and "Salaries and expenses, Defense Production Activities, Department of Commerce" may be made by agreement between the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Defense Production Administration with approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

DEFENSE TRANSPORT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Defense Transport Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$2,200,000.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Small Defense Plants Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings

1 concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, and pur-
2 chase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor
3 vehicles, \$3,500,000.

4 REVOLVING FUND

5 For the revolving fund authorized by paragraph (2) of
6 subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act
7 of 1950, as amended, \$3,000,000.

8 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

9 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

11 ACTIVITIES

12 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
13 enable the Federal Security Agency to carry out its functions
14 under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended,
15 including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
16 the purposes of this appropriation, \$400,000.

17 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

18 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

20 ACTIVITIES

21 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
22 Agriculture to carry out its functions under the Defense
23 Production Act of 1950, as amended, \$2,000,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

4 ACTIVITIES

5 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
6 Commerce to carry out its functions under the Defense
7 Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of pas-
8 senger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; expenses of
9 attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this
10 appropriation; and reimbursement of General Services Ad-
11 ministration for security guard services; \$25,000,000.

12 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

13 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

15 ACTIVITIES

16 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
17 the Interior to carry out its functions under the Defense
18 Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of pas-
19 senger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; and expenses
20 of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of
21 this appropriation; \$2,500,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

2 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

4 ACTIVITIES

5 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
6 Justice to carry out its functions under the Defense Pro-
7 duction Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of
8 attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this
9 appropriation, \$90,000.

10 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

11 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

13 ACTIVITIES

14 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
15 Labor to carry out its functions under the Defense Produc-
16 tion Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attend-
17 ance at meetings concerned with the purpose of this appro-
18 priation, \$1,750,000.

19 FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

20 OPERATIONS

21 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in
22 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense

1 Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress), including
2 purchase (not to exceed eight) and hire of passenger motor
3 vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
4 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the
5 Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of em-
6 ployees occupying positions of critical importance from the
7 standpoint of national security; expenses of attendance at
8 meetings concerned with civil defense functions; reimburse-
9 ment of the General Services Administration for security
10 guard services; not to exceed \$9,000 for the purchase
11 of newspapers, periodicals, and teletype news services; and
12 not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary ex-
13 penses to be expended under the direction of the Administra-
14 tor for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determina-
15 tion thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$8,000,000.

16 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

17 For financial contributions to the States, not otherwise
18 provided for, pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the
19 Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, to be equally matched
20 with State funds, \$29,500,000.

21 PROCUREMENT FUND

22 The "Civil Defense Procurement Fund" is continued
23 available without fiscal year limitation.

CHAPTER XI

CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in House Document Numbered 517, and Senate Document Numbered 144, Eighty-second Congress, \$6,489,954, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

1 CHAPTER XII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

3 SEC. 1201. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the
4 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year,
5 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946
6 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor
7 vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station
8 wagons), is hereby fixed at \$1,400, notwithstanding the
9 provisions of Section 405 of the Independent Offices Appro-
10 priation Act, 1953.

11 SEC. 1202. Unless otherwise specified and during the
12 current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained
13 in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensa-
14 tion of any officer or employee of the Government of the
15 United States (including any agency the majority of the
16 stock of which is owned by the Government of the United
17 States) whose post of duty is in continental United States
18 unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States,
19 (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the
20 date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizen-
21 ship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen
22 of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person
23 who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided*, That
24 for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such
25 person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the

1 requirements of this section with respect to his status have
2 been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person
3 making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon
4 conviction, shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned
5 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That
6 the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in
7 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
8 *vided further*, That any payment made to any officer or
9 employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be
10 recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This
11 section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the
12 Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the
13 United States in the current defense effort.

14 SEC. 1203. Appropriations of the executive departments
15 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,
16 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the
17 activity concerned, are hereby made available for living
18 quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26,
19 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed there-
20 under, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed
21 under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946,
22 in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regula-
23 tions of the President, for all civilian officers and employees
24 of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-
25 tries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made

1 to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions
2 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected
3 hereby.

4 SEC. 1204. No part of any appropriation for the cur-
5 rent fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be
6 paid to any person for the filling of any position for which
7 he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted
8 not to approve the nomination of said person.

9 SEC. 1205. No part of any appropriation contained in
10 this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of \$4
11 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United
12 States Code Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased
13 on condition and with the understanding that latest pub-
14 lished cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the
15 date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in
16 excess of \$4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes
17 of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

18 SEC. 1206. Funds made available by this or any other
19 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of
20 the corporations and agencies subject to the Government
21 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841),
22 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds
23 are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia;
24 examination of budgets and estimates of appropriations in
25 the field; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act

1 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and the objects specified
2 under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable
3 to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in
4 the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That
5 in the event any functions budgeted as administrative ex-
6 penses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other
7 funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be
8 correspondingly reduced.

9 SEC. 1207. No part of any funds of or available to any
10 wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for
11 the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the
12 purchase or construction of any office building at the seat
13 of government primarily for occupancy by any department
14 or agency of the United States Government or by any cor-
15 poration owned by the United States Government.

16 SEC. 1208. No part of any appropriation contained in
17 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
18 corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the
19 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike
20 against the Government of the United States or who is a
21 member of an organization of Government employees that
22 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
23 United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an or-
24 ganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
25 of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for

1 the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima
2 facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not
3 contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike
4 against the Government of the United States, is not a member
5 of an organization of Government employees that asserts the
6 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
7 or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
8 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
9 Government of the United States by force or violence: *Pro-*
10 *vided further*, That any person who engages in a strike
11 against the Government of the United States or who is a
12 member of an organization of Government employees that
13 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
14 United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an
15 organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Govern-
16 ment of the United States by force or violence and accepts
17 employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any
18 appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall
19 be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not
20 more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year,
21 or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause
22 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
23 provisions of existing law.

24 SEC. 1209. No payment shall be made from appropri-
25 ations in this Act or any other to any officer on the retired

1 lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine
2 Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and
3 Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period
4 of two years after retirement who for himself or for others
5 is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of
6 or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Depart-
7 ment of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic
8 Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war
9 materials.

10 SEC. 1210. Appropriations and funds made available by
11 this or any other Act for salaries, wages, or compensation
12 shall also be available for payment of any tax with respect
13 thereto which is imposed on any department, agency, cor-
14 poration, or other instrumentality of the United States, as an
15 employer, by the provisions of the Social Security Act
16 Amendments of 1950.

17 SEC. 1211. During the current fiscal year, personnel
18 and appropriations or funds available for salaries and ex-
19 penses to any department, agency, or corporation in the
20 executive branch of the Government, shall be transferred to
21 any defense activity under the jurisdiction of such depart-
22 ment or agency in such numbers or amounts as may be
23 necessary for the discharge of responsibilities relating to
24 the national defense assigned to such department, agency,
25 or corporation by or pursuant to law.

1 SEC. 1212. None of the funds provided by this Act shall
2 be used to pay employees at a rate in excess of that paid for
3 comparable work under the regular appropriations provided
4 to the departments and agencies concerned in the regular
5 1953 appropriation Acts.

6 SEC. 1213. During the current fiscal year, the provisions
7 of Bureau of the Budget Circular A-45, dated June 3, 1952,
8 shall be controlling over the activities of all departments,
9 agencies, and corporations of the Government: *Provided*,
10 That said circular may be amended or changed during such
11 year by the Director of the Budget with the approval of the
12 chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House
13 of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of the
14 Budget shall make a report to Congress not later than Janu-
15 ary 31, 1953, of the operations of this order upon all depart-
16 ments, agencies, and corporations of the Government: *Pro-*
17 *vided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any
18 other law no officer or employee shall be required to occupy
19 any Government-owned quarters unless the head of the agency
20 concerned shall determine that necessary service cannot be
21 rendered or property of the United States cannot be ade-
22 quately protected otherwise.

23 SEC. 1214. The appropriations, authorizations, and
24 authority with respect thereto in this Act or any regular
25 annual appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 which

1 has not been enacted into law prior to July 1, 1952, shall
2 be available from and including such date for the purposes
3 respectively provided in such appropriations, authorizations,
4 and authority. All obligations incurred during the period
5 between June 30, 1952, and the date of enactment of
6 this Act or the applicable Act in anticipation of such ap-
7 propriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified
8 and confirmed if in accordance with the respective terms
9 thereof.

10 SEC. 1215. This Act may be cited as the "Supplemental
11 Appropriation Act, 1953".

82ND CONGRESS
2^D Session

H. R. 8370

[Report No. 2316]

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for
other purposes.

By Mr. CANNON

JUNE 26, 1952

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 27, 1952
For actions of June 26, 1952
82nd-2nd, No. 113

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,4,7,32	Legislative program.....9	Rubber.....28
Banking and currency.....29	Minerals.....15	Social security.....9
Defense production1,2,11,21,22,32	Personnel.....1,4,16,20	Soil conservation.....17
Electrification.....23	Price control.....1,2,22	Storage investigation....8
Foreign aid.....1,31	Purchasing.....1	Taxation.....24
Forestry.....17	Reclamation.....13,14	Textiles.....25
Immigration.....3,7,12	Research.....18	Transportation.....26
Irrigation.....27	Road authorizations.....30	Tuna-fish imports.....10
Labor, farm.....1,5,22	Roads.....7	Water utilization.....14

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed defense production bill. House committee reported supplemental appropriation bill including items for defense production and foreign aid. House recommitted independent offices appropriation bill to conference with instructions to insist on Jensen amendment. House voted to override veto of immigration and naturalization bill. Senate passed State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill. Senate adopted conference report on Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. Ready for President. Senate adopted resolution extending CCC investigation. Senate committee reported legislative appropriation bill. Senate passed bill increasing social security payments.

HOUSE

1. **SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953.** The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 8370 (H. Rept. 2316)(p. 8320). The bill includes the following items:

Defense production activities:

Department of Agriculture, \$2,000,000 (Budget estimate, \$3,000,000). The committee report states: "Although the committee has specifically denied the request of the department to transfer section 32 funds to defense activities, the funds recommended in the amount of \$2,000,000 are adequate if this agency will utilize its regular services to a larger degree than is presently anticipated. The amount recommended includes \$75,000 for preparation of data on farm wages, farm supply, and requirements by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The results of these studies will be extremely useful to those who are assisting the farmer to meet his manpower requirements."

Office of Defense Mobilization, \$1,000,000 (Budget estimate, \$1,550,000).

Defense Production Administration, \$2,750,000 (Budget estimate, \$3,500,000).

Commerce Department, including NPA, \$25,000,000 (Budget estimate, \$35,000,000).

Defense Transport Administration, \$2,200,000 (Budget estimate, \$2,500,000).

Small Defense Plants Administration, \$6,500,000 (Budget estimate, \$9,200,000).

Mexican farm-labor program, Bureau of Employment Security, Labor Department, \$2,800,000 (Budget estimate, \$3,000,000). The committee disallowed the

\$270,000 to supplement the revolving fund with the following explanation: "This revolving fund was established by the appropriation of \$1,000,000 in ...1952. It was established with the understanding that the fees collected from employers for certain transportation and subsistence expenses of Mexican farm workers would be sufficient to keep the fund solvent at all times. It is the strong desire of the committee that no additional expenses be assumed by the fund which might jeopardize its solvency." The report further states: "The Bureau estimates that 275,000 Mexican farm workers will be brought into the United States during 1953 as compared with 200,000 during 1952."

Foreign aid, including military aid, economic and technical assistance, government and relief in the occupied areas, a total of \$6,275,940,750 (Budget estimate, \$6,526,060,750).

Federal Civil Defense Administration, \$37,500,000 (Budget estimate, ... \$600,000,000).

Claims, audited claims, and judgments, various amounts.

General Provisions: The committee report explains these provisions as follows:

"The general provisions included in this bill cover all agencies and corporations of the Federal Government in practically the same manner as they did a year ago in the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1952 and in most cases are substantially the same as those which were carried in that bill.

"Section 1201 continues, at \$1,400 each, the limitation on the amount that may be spent for purchase of passenger motor vehicles. This is the same figure that is carried in the 1952 Act.

"Section 1202 continues language which has been carried for some time concerning the employment of aliens.

"Section 1203 continues language previously carried relating to living quarters allowances.

"Section 1204 continues language previously carried prohibiting the filling of positions by anyone whose nomination has been disapproved by the Senate.

"Section 1205 continues language previously carried limiting the amount that may be paid for copies of the United States Code Annotated.

"Section 1206 continues language previously carried relating to the use of funds by Government corporations.

"Section 1207 continues language previously carried prohibiting the use of funds of corporations for purchase or construction of office buildings at the seat of Government.

"Section 1208 continues language previously carried commonly known as the anti-strike provision.

"Section 1209 continues language previously carried concerning payments to retired officers who may be conducting negotiations with the Government.

"Section 1210 continues, and makes permanent, language previously carried authorizing the use of appropriated funds for payment of taxes where the United States is an employer as defined by the provisions of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950.

"Section 1211 continues language previously carried to authorize the transfer of personnel and appropriations to defense activities of various departments and agencies of the Government in pursuance of law.

"Section 1212 prohibits the use of funds in this Act to pay employees at rates in excess of that provided in the regular 1953 appropriation acts. This is similar to a provision in last year's bill.

"Section 1213 carries new language concerning rental of Government-owned living quarters. This language incorporates, by reference, Bureau of the Budget Circular A-45 and is recommended by the committee in order to establish a more uniform and equitable handling of the rental problem. The language in this section provides that a report on its operations shall be made to Congress early in the 83rd Congress at which time the Committee can give the matter further consideration and make a redetermination as to the proper steps that should be taken.

"Section 1214 contains language validating obligations incurred by the various departments and agencies whose bills have not been finally approved by July 1, 1952. This will cover the period from July 1, 1952, to the date of enactment of the various Acts."

2. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Passed, 211-185, with amendments S. 2594, to amend and extend the Defense Production Act (pp. 8320-56). Reps. Spence, Brown of Ga., Patman, Rains, Wolcott, Gamble, and Talle were appointed conferees (p. 8356). Both versions of the bill (as passed by the House and Senate) were printed in the Record (pp. 8351-6). Before passing the bill, the House agreed to the following amendments:
 - By Rep. Talle, to suspend price control when materials have been sold below below ceilings for 3 months or when such materials are in adequate supply and are not rationed; by a 210-182 vote (p. 8345).
 - By Rep. Cole, Kans., to guarantee percentage mark-ups of individual wholesalers and retailers; by a 231-164 vote (p. 8346).
 - By Rep. Lucas, to abolish the Wage Stabilization Board and create a new agency that could not deal with labor disputes; by a 256-138 vote (pp. 8346-7).
 - By Rep. Smith, Va., requesting the President to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act in connection with the steel dispute; by a 228-164 vote (p. 8348).Rejected, 150-244, the Barden amendment to end price and wage controls on July 31, 1952 (pp. 8348-9).
3. IMMIGRATION. By a 278-113 vote, overrode the President's veto of H. R. 5678, to revise the immigration and naturalization laws (pp. 8357-67).
4. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Agreed, 195-181, to a Phillips motion to recommit to conference this bill, H. R. 7072, with instructions that the House conferees insist on disagreement to various Senate amendments. One of these was the Senate amendment to strike out the Jensen amendment, which would limit the filling of personnel vacancies. The conferees had agreed to eliminate the Jensen amendment and also the Ferguson amendment providing a 10% cut in personnel, but they had agreed to various individual cuts in lieu of these general provisions. Rep. Phillips, however, stated his position that the Jensen amendment is more desirable than these direct cuts in appropriations. (pp. 8367-78.)
5. FARM LABOR. Rep. Rogers, Tex., spoke in favor of H. R. 1271, to exempt certain farm laborers from the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and stated that a recent interpretation of the Act by the Labor Department will hamper farm operations (pp. 8380-3).
6. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Received from the President the annual reports of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems (H. Doc. 523) and the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (H. Doc. 522); to Foreign Affairs Committee (p. 8378).
7. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 7313, the legislative appropriation bill for 1953 (S. Rept. 1828)(p. 8235). This bill was made the unfinished business (p. 8314).
 - Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6854, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1953 (p. 8269). This bill will now be sent to the President.

SENATE

Passed with amendments H. R. 7289, State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill for 1953. Sens. McCarran, McKellar, Ellender, Green, Bridges, Saltonstall, and Ferguson were appointed as conferees. Adopted a Case amendment reducing by \$4,455,399 State Department funds for salaries and expenses, and a Smith (N.J.) amendment increasing by \$1,981,516 State Department funds for international information and educational activities. Rejected Magnuson and Humphrey amendments to increase by \$2,500,000 funds for salaries and expenses of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and a Douglas amendment barring disbursements to any State submitting a program for Federal aid to highways in excess of 91% of the amount apportioned therefor. (pp. 8239-68.)

The Appropriations Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 7391, Defense Department appropriation bill for 1953 (p. 8647).

8. STORAGE INVESTIGATION. Adopted S. Res. 338, authorizing a 2 months' extension of storage and processing activities of the CCC (p. 8237).
9. SOCIAL SECURITY. Passed with amendments H. R. 7800, to amend the Social Security Act, increasing old-age and survivors insurance benefits (pp. 8272-4, 8276-8300).
10. TUNA-FISH IMPORTS. Sen. Morse entered motion to reconsider the vote of June 24 rejecting H. R. 5693, relating to imposition of import duties on tuna fish (p. 8268).
The Finance Committee approved a committee resolution directing the Tariff Commission to make an investigation of the domestic tuna fish industry, including the effects of imports of tuna, and make a report of its findings on or before March 1, 1953 (p. 8269).
11. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Sens. Maybank, Fulbright, Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Capehart, Bricker, and Ives were appointed conferees on S. 2594, to amend and extend the Defense Production Act (pp. 8300-1).
12. IMMIGRATION. Agreed to consider today a motion to override the President's veto of H. R. 5678, to revise the immigration and naturalization laws (pp. 8286-7).
13. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7305, to authorize the sale of land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Company (S. Rept. 1840) (p. 8236).
14. RECLAMATION; WATER UTILIZATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments H. R. 2470, granting consent of Congress for Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to enter into a compact for disposition and allocation of Columbia River waters (S. Rept. 1841) (p. 8236).
15. MINERALS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. 2236, to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases (S. Rept. 1843) (p. 8236).
16. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7806, to authorize the participation by Federal employees, without loss of pay or leave, in funerals of deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to this country for burial (S. Rept. 1849) (p. 8236).

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7641, providing benefits for Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation because of any policy or program of this Government during World War II (S. Rept. 1851) (p. 8236).

Received proposed legislation from the Treasury Department which would provide an income credit in case of civil service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States to Finance Committee (p. 8234).

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued June 30, 1952

For actions of June 27-28, 1952
82nd-2nd, Nos. 114 and 115

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	32,40	Food.....	42	Price control.....	30,36
Anthrax.....	44	Foot-&-mouth disease...	1,33	Puerto Rico.....	17,31
Appropriations		Foreign aid.....	1,21,29	Reclamation.....	2
.....	1,13,29,33,39,48	Forestry.....	27	Research.....	1,8,33
Cheese.....	30	Fruits and vegetables....	30	Rubber.....	47
Construction contracts...	15	Immigration.....	12	School-lunch program....	29
Consumers.....	35	Import control.....	44	Soil conservation.....	20
Defense production		Inflation.....	46	Taxation.....	18
.....	1,6,23,30,46	International Materials		Tobacco.....	7,26,28
Economic stabilization...	29	Conference.....	38	Trade, foreign.....	38
Emergency powers.....	5,37	Land transfers.....	9,26,28	Transportation.....	3,49
Extension work.....	26,28	Legislative program.....	40	Veterans' benefits....	19,34
Fabrics, flammable.....	14	Livestock.....	25	Water utilization.....	41
Farm program.....	10,16	Milk.....	36	Wildlife conservation...	11
Fertilizer.....	30	Minerals.....	22,45	Wool.....	43
Flood control.....	4	Personnel.....	24,29		

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on appropriation bill for foot-and-mouth disease laboratory. House committee reported Bosone small-reclamation projects bill. House committee reported bills to adjust burley tobacco quotas and authorize consolidated insect-research laboratory. Senate overrode veto of immigration bill. Senate committee reported flammable-fabrics bill. Sen. Ken denied Secretary Brannan's charges on voting record. House concurred in Senate amendments to bills on extension-work authorizations, Md. tobacco quotas, and Ft. Robinson land transfer. House passed appropriation bill for foreign aid and defense production activities. Both Houses agreed to conference report on defense production bill. Senate passed Korean GI bill. Senate debated defense appropriation bill.

HOUSE - June 27

~~1. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7860, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1952. The conferees agreed to the following proviso, to be added to the item for a foot-and-mouth disease laboratory in lieu of the proviso which had been proposed by the Senate: "at a location to be selected by the Secretary of Agriculture after full hearings of which reasonable public notice shall be given to those who may reside within twenty-five miles from the island selected." (pp. 8440-1.)~~

~~Began debate on H. R. 8370, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1953, which includes items for foreign aid and defense-production activities (pp. 8390-431).~~

~~House conferees were appointed on H. R. 7176, the Interior appropriation bill (p. 8390). Senate conferees were appointed June 25.~~

~~House conferees were appointed on H. R. 7289, the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill (p. 8390). Senate conferees were appointed June 26.~~

~~2. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7084, the Bosone bill to facilitate the development of small reclamation projects (H. Rept. 2328)(p. 8455).~~

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6163, to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, etc. (H. Rept. 2327)(p. 8455).

3. TRANSPORTATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 2357, to make clear that horticultural commodities are included in the provision of the Interstate Commerce Act which exempts the transportation of agricultural commodities from ICC regulation (p. 8432).
4. FLOOD CONTROL. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 7817, to authorize emergency flood-control work made necessary by the recent floods (pp. 8432-3).
5. EMERGENCY POWERS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 490, to continue various emergency powers until July 3, 1952, pending enactment of the regular bill on this subject (p. 8440).
6. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. The conference report on S. 2594, to extend and amend the Defense Production Act, was ordered to be printed as H. Rept. 2350 (p. 8456).
7. TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 8170 to reduce the minimum acreage allotments for burley tobacco (H. Rept. 2349)(p. 8456).
8. INSECT RESEARCH. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7952, to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters (H. Rept. 2348)(p. 8456).
9. LAND TRANSFERS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 2603, to return to Oregon 2 acres of previously donated land for fish-hatchery use (H. Rept. 2347)(p. 8456).
The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee reported without amendment S. 3052, to authorize various property transactions, including transfer to the Navy Department of a tract of land which had previously been used by USDA in connection with an emergency rubber project (H. Rept. 2335)(p. 8455).
10. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Furcolo commended the accomplishments of the farm program during the last few years (pp. 8444-9).
11. WILDLIFE CONSERVATION. Rep. Staggers urged greater efforts toward conservation of our natural resources, particularly wildlife (pp. 8449-50).

SENATE - June 27

12. IMMIGRATION. By a 57-26 vote, passed over the President's veto H. R. 5678, to revise the immigration and naturalization laws (pp. 8461-76). The bill has now become law.
13. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 7313, the legislative appropriation bill for 1953. Senate conferees were appointed. (pp. 8476-501.)
The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 7391, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1953 (S. Rept. 1861)(p. 8458).
14. FLAMMABLE FABRICS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment S. 2918, to prohibit interstate commerce in articles of wearing

(3) and (5) except that the provisions of any closing agreement entered into by the contractor and the Bureau of Internal Revenue applicable with respect to amounts deposited in the reserve funds prior to the first taxable year ending after July 31, 1951, shall govern determinations of the basis of property acquired, constructed, or reconstructed with such deposits, by attributing to amounts on deposit in the reserve funds the basis which under this subparagraph would be attributed to property acquired therewith.

"(12) For the purposes of this section, amounts withdrawn from the reserve funds or expended in accordance with the purposes of such funds shall be considered to represent the deposits in such funds in order of deposit and the funds shall be treated as a unit.

"(13) Deficiencies or overpayments of tax resulting from delay by the Commission in any of the determinations required under paragraph (6) shall not be subject to interest until ninety days after such determinations are made by the Commission."

SEC. 22. Section 805 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In determining the rights and obligations of any contractor under a contract authorized by title VI or title VII of this act, no salary for personal services in excess of \$25,000 per annum paid to a director, officer, or employee by said contractor, its affiliates, subsidiary, or associates, shall be taken into account. The terms 'director', 'officer', or 'employee' shall be constructed in the broadest sense. The term 'salary' shall include wages and allowances of compensation in any form for personal services which will result in a director, officer, or employee receiving total compensation for his personal services from such sources exceeding in amount or value \$25,000 per annum."

SEC. 23. Section 905 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(1) The terms 'United States Maritime Commission' and 'Commission' shall mean the Secretary of Commerce, the Maritime Administrator, or the Federal Maritime Board as the context may require to conform to Reorganization Plan Numbered 21 of 1950, effective May 24, 1950."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, line 9, after the word "fixed", insert the words "by the Commission."

Page 7, line 17, strike out "(1)."

Page 7, line 22, strike out "(A)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)."

Page 7, line 25, strike out "(B)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

Page 3, line 14, strike out "(B)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

Page 8, strike out lines 22 and 23, and on page 9, strike out lines 1 through 17.

Page 9, line 18, strike out "(3)."

Page 9, line 21, after the words "by the taxpayer," insert a period and strike out the remainder of line 21 and line 22, and on page 10, strike out lines 1 through 7.

Page 10, line 8, strike out "(4)."

Page 10, line 9, strike out "(A)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)."

Page 10, line 10, strike out "(B)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

Page 10, amend lines 13, 14, and 15 to read "SEC. 11. Section 511 (d) of such act is amended to read as follows."

Page 10, line 16, strike out "(1)."

Page 10, line 22, strike out the words "as follows:" and the remainder of section 11, through and including line 18, on page 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "reduced by that portion of the deposits in the fund expended in the construction, reconstruction, reconditioning, acquisition, or liquidation of purchase-money indebtedness

of the new vessel which represents gain not recognized for tax purposes under subsection (c)."

Page 13, line 19, strike out all of section 12 through and including line 2 on page 14.

Page 14, line 3, strike out "Sec. 13" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 12."

Page 14, line 22, strike out the parenthetical clause "(other than a deposit of earnings)."

Page 15, line 19, strike out all of paragraph (2), section 13, through and including line 6 on page 16.

Page 16, line 7, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

Page 16, line 18, strike out all of section 14, through and including line 22.

Page 16, line 23, strike out all of section 15, through and including line 7 on page 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 13. Section 511 (1) of such act is amended by inserting after the words 'portion thereof' in the second sentence the following: 'with respect to a deposit made in any taxable year ending on or before June 30, 1945.'"

Page 18, line 8, strike out "SEC. 16" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 14."

Page 18, lines 14 and 15, strike out the words "by an affirmative vote of not less than three members."

Page 18, after line 20 insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 15. Section 605 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No operating-differential subsidy shall be paid for the operation of a vessel that is more than 20 years of age except one whose life expectancy has been determined as provided in section 607 (b) for a period in no case to exceed the life expectancy determined thereunder, unless the Commission finds that it is to the public interest to grant such financial aid for the operation of such vessel and enters a formal order thereon, and the Commission shall include in each annual report a full report covering each case in which such exception is made, with the reasons therefor."

Page 18, line 21, strike out "SEC. 17" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 16."

Page 19, line 1, strike out "SEC. 18" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 17."

Page 19, line 8, insert word "subsidized" before the word "vessels."

Page 19, line 15, strike out "SEC. 19" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 18."

Page 19, line 19, strike out "SEC. 20" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 19."

Page 19, line 25, strike out the semicolon and insert a period after the word "Commission" and strike out lines 1 and 2 on page 20.

Page 20, line 3, strike out all of section 21, through and including line 19, page 27, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 20. Section 607 (h) of such act is amended, effective with respect to taxable years ending after July 31, 1951, to read as follows:

"(h) The earnings or gains of any contractor receiving an operating-differential subsidy under authority of this act, which are deposited in the contractor's reserve funds as provided in this section, shall be treated as follows for Federal tax purposes:

"(1) Amounts required to be deposited as depreciation in the capital reserve fund shall be deductible in computing income subject to income and excess-profits taxes.

"(2) The proceeds of any insurance or indemnities received by the contractor on account of the total loss of subsidized vessel and the proceeds of any sale or other disposition of a subsidized vessel, to the extent such proceeds represent gain, and earnings or gains on amounts deposited in the capital reserve fund (other than amounts transferred from the special reserve fund) shall not be recognized for income or excess-profits tax purposes.

"(3) Amounts deposited as depreciation in the capital reserve fund which exceed the depreciation which would be allowed under the Internal Revenue Code (assuming the life expectancy determined under section 607 (b)) and amounts described in paragraph (2) which are not recognized for tax purposes, shall not be recognized in the determination of the tax basis of any property in the acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of which such amounts are expended or in the determination of equity capital or total assets for excess profits tax purposes.

"(4) Earnings deposited in the capital reserve fund, other than the amounts described in paragraphs (1) and (2), and earnings deposited in the special reserve fund shall be treated as "partially tax deferred." "Partially tax deferred" earnings shall not be recognized for purposes of the normal tax on corporations, but shall be recognized for purposes of the surtax and excess profits tax imposed upon corporations. "Partially tax deferred" amounts shall not include capital gains deposited in the capital reserve fund or the special reserve fund.

"(5) Amounts treated as "partially tax deferred" under paragraph (4) shall be recognized in the determination of the tax basis of any property acquired, constructed, or reconstructed therewith and in the determination of equity capital or total assets for excess tax purposes as follows:

"(A) So much of the "partially tax deferred" deposit in any year as would be subject, but for paragraph (4), only to the normal tax shall not be recognized in determining basis or in determining equity capital or total assets for excess profits purposes, and

"(B) The amount of the "partially tax deferred" deposit in excess of the portion of the deposit described in the preceding subparagraph shall be recognized in the determination of basis and in the determination of equity capital or total assets for excess profits tax purposes in such proportion as the sum of the surtax and the excess profits tax attributable to such amount bears to the total tax which would have been imposed on such amount but for paragraph (4).

"If "partially tax deferred" amounts are used to reduce indebtedness, proper adjustment shall be made in the basis of the property subject to the indebtedness.

"(6) In computing the net income of the contractor for income and excess profits tax purposes—

"(A) The amount of operating-differential subsidy accrual payable to the contractor for any taxable year, including amounts withheld by the Commission, shall be included in the income of the contractor for such year;

"(B) A deduction shall be allowed for the taxable year in the amount of subsidy reimbursement determined by the Commission to be chargeable to the contractor for such year; and

"(C) Any amount previously withheld from subsidy payments to offset such reimbursement liability which is released and paid to the contractor shall be included in the income of the contractor in the year in which paid.

"(7) Earnings or gains on deposit in the reserve funds at the termination of the contract, or withdrawn from the special reserve fund and paid into the contractor's general funds (other than for reimbursement of operating losses as provided under section 607 (c)) or distributed as dividends or bonuses, shall be taxable as follows:

"(A) "Partially tax deferred" amounts shall, in the year of termination or withdrawal, be subject to the amount of normal tax which would have been imposed but for this section in the year in which such amounts were deposited, and

"(B) Other earnings or gains shall, to the extent not taxable upon deposit in the funds, be taxable, in the year of termination or withdrawal, under the tax rates and provisions applicable in the year of deposit. Amounts withdrawn from the special reserve funds and used to reimburse the contractor's general funds for operating losses under section 607 (c) shall, to the extent such amount would not be recognized in the determination tax basis under paragraph (5) or under the provisions of any closing agreement entered into between the contractor and the Bureau of Internal Revenue applicable with respect to deposits made prior to the first taxable year ending after July 31, 1951, be included in income of the contractor in the year of withdrawal from the fund.

"(8) Amounts deposited in the capital or special reserve funds shall not constitute an accumulation of earnings or profits within the meaning of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(9) In computing the net operating loss deduction of the contractor under section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code—

"(A) The gross income of the contractor for purposes of section 122 (a) and the net income of the contractor for purposes of section 122 (b) and (c) shall include amounts treated as "partially tax deferred" under paragraph (4);

"(B) The normal-tax net income of the contractor for purposes of section 122 (c) shall be an amount equal to the surtax net income; and

"(C) The net income of the contractor, for purposes of the computation under section 122 (c), shall be increased by the amount of interest on obligations of the United States or its instrumentalities described in section 26 (a).

"(10) The excess-profits credit of the contractor shall be determined in accordance with the following provisions:

"(A) The average base period net income of the contractor shall be computed by including in excess-profits net income determined under section 433 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code for any taxable year the amount of earnings (not including capital gains) deposited by the contractor in the reserve funds in such year other than:

"(i) Required deposits of depreciation.

"(ii) The amount of subsidy reimbursement determined by the Commission to be chargeable to the contractor for such year; and

"(iii) Earnings on amounts deposited in the capital reserve fund (other than amounts transferred from the special reserve fund).

"(B) The equity capital of the contractor for purposes of section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code and the total assets of the contractor for purposes of sections 435 (e) (3), 440 (b), and 442 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be computed by determining, to the extent applicable, the adjusted basis of assets of the contractor in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs (3) and (5) or the provisions of any closing agreement entered into by the contractor and the Bureau of Internal Revenue applicable with respect to amounts deposited in the reserve funds prior to the first taxable year ending after July 31, 1951, and by attributing to amounts on deposit in the reserve funds the basis which would be attributed, under paragraphs (3) and (5) or under such closing agreement, to property acquired therewith.

"(11) For the purposes of this section, amounts withdrawn from the reserve funds or expended in accordance with the purposes of such funds shall be considered to represent the deposits in such funds in the order of deposit."

Page 27, line 20, strike out "Sec. 22" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 21."

Page 28, line 3, strike out the word "constructed" and insert in lieu thereof the word "construed."

Page 28, line 9, strike out "Sec. 23" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 22."

Page 28, line 11, strike out "(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. This involves simply changing in three places a date which was inadvertently placed in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HART. On page 33, line 6, page 29, line 11, page 35, line 5, delete "1951" and insert in lieu thereof "1952."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 704 was laid on the table.

TAXATION OF LIFE-INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7876) relating to the taxation of life-insurance companies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 (a) (1) relating to imposition of tax on life-insurance companies) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding after "1951" wherever it appears, "and 1952."

(b) Section 203A (relating to adjusted normal-tax net income of life-insurance companies of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding after "1951," wherever it appears, "and 1952."

(c) Section 433 (a) (1) (H) (relating to excess profits net income of life-insurance companies) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding after "1951," wherever it appears, "and 1952."

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 201 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code and sections 201 (a) (1), 203A, and 433 (a) (1) (H) of the Internal Revenue Code as amended by this Act shall be applicable to taxable years beginning in 1952.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, this bill continues for another year, 1952, the method adopted in the Revenue Act of 1951 for the taxation of life-insurance companies. This is stopgap legislation pending a permanent solution of the problem of the taxation of life-insurance companies.

The provision in the Revenue Act of 1951 which is continued by this bill imposes an income tax of 3¾ percent of so much of the net investment income of life-insurance companies as is not in

excess of \$200,000 and 6½ percent of the amount over \$200,000.

Another provision in the Revenue Act of 1951 was intended to relieve from a substantial part of the tax those companies whose investment income is inadequate with respect to their policy obligations.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. ROONEY, FLOOD, PRESTON, MARSHALL, MAHON, CLEVINGER, H. CARL ANDERSEN, and TABER.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. KIRWAN, NORRELL, JACKSON of Washington, FURCOLO, CANNON, JENSEN, JAMES, and TABER.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours.

Mr. TABER. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is the last of the appropriation bills for the session, and the Congress. The estimates on which the appropriations submitted by the bill are based aggregate \$13,750,796,030. The bill as recommended by the committee carries a total of \$10,283,133,780, a reduction of \$3,467,662,250.

The bill, like all final deficiency bills, provides for numerous items from many departments. But three items require special note.

The atomic-energy program embraces an appropriation of \$485,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission, and \$150,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority which is tied in with the program.

The Military Public Works section includes \$600,090,000 for the Army, \$386,409,840 for the Navy, and \$1,200,000,000 for the Air Force.

And for Mutual Security, the appropriation for which has just been authorized by the legislative bill, the sum of \$6,275,940,750.

We do not want to minimize the significance of the figures in this bill. They are very large. But I do wish to call attention to the fact that they are practically all, with minor exceptions, appropriations for the national defense, appropriations about which we have little choice. National defense accounts for \$13,600,000,000 of the total estimates. And only \$150,000,000 are for nondefense items and they have been reduced from \$150,000,000 to \$28,000,000. In the beginning, when war seemed imminent, we necessarily accepted the estimates without question. There was neither opportunity nor time to question them. But now that the probability of war is receding, we are scrutinizing these items just as carefully as we scrutinize nonmilitary items, and we submit a bill today which has been exhaustively considered and investigated and carefully processed and weeded out, and in which we have made material savings.

Mr. Chairman, time is short. The session is nearing its close. These are items that are generally understood and largely familiar to the membership and to the country at large. There is no occasion for extended debate. Certainly no amount of debate will change the votes we expect to cast on the various items as they come up for individual determination.

So, Mr. Chairman, I trust members of the Committee will take no time unnecessarily. Members can extend their remarks in the RECORD, and get the same results back home, while here on the floor we can better express our attitude by votes rather than by what we say.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 23 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill involves an over-all total of \$10,283,000,000. It presents some kind of an appropriation in one way or another for almost every agency of the Government. The big items are the atomic energy picture, involving almost \$1,700,000,000; the Defense Department, involving \$2,187,000,000; the mutual security set-up, involving \$6,275,000,000; and approximately \$81,000,000 for emergency agencies.

There are some things about the bill that I do not like. Frankly, I do not see what else we can do except to provide the atomic energy item and the small items for independent offices, with the exception of the TVA.

The Defense Department set-up has been reduced \$805,000,000. It was almost all for military construction, and of a type that it was absolutely necessary that we allow it. We were unable to get anything in the nature of line-item justifications from the Air Force as to the items that were involved in their estimates, and for that reason we had to give them a blind appropriation. They have unobligated a billion and a half of funds that have been previously appropriated, and had obligated only a very small percentage of the funds that were allowed to them by previous appropriations. I think we have provided very liberally for them.

The Army and the Navy were able to give us a justification by line items, because they had prepared their programs with a great deal more care, and the cuts that were made on them were very moderate and of a small percentage.

I think the funds which have been allowed the Air Force will readily carry them through the 30th of June next. I do not believe they will be able to obligate the \$1,200,000,000 that we have allowed before the end of June 1953.

We had the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force before us on this proposition because it was absolutely impossible to go over a stack of applications that high—that is as high as my hip from the floor—and give them any consideration in the time allotted to the committee for hearings on this subject, and it would have been very difficult for them to operate in that way.

In the Air Force they need more decisions as to what they want to do. For instance, there were airports where, after construction had started, they changed the design at least five times. You get that same sort of irresponsibility and failure of capacity to make decisions all along the line. That has been a great handicap to our Air Force for a very considerable period, and I believe has been more responsible than lack of appropriations for failure to get more airplanes. There was one other small item in the defense picture besides construction, but not a big one.

On the mutual-security item the committee found a lot of things that dis-

turbed us; for instance, we found that while the estimates of unobligated balances were given to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and Foreign Relations of the other body when the authorization bill for mutual security was under consideration as being \$400,000,000. We had a special hearing on that, and the clerk of the committee, Mr. Harvey, made a special investigation into it with Mr. Foster, the Under Secretary of Defense, and Mr. Tyler Wood, the representative of the Mutual Security set-up, and it appeared that instead of their being \$400,000,000 unobligated balances as of the 1st of July there was no question but what it would amount to \$668,400,000. That appears on page 9 of the special hearings; and it appears from the table on page 15 that out of a figure that was given later, \$138,000,000 out of another figure of \$257,000,000 will be unobligated. So that the total unobligated balance as of July 4 will be not less than \$807,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the committee, acting upon the information that was given it in connection with this \$807,000,000, did cut \$200,000,000 off the figure; but the bill is still in an embarrassing situation, because we could very readily, in my opinion, have taken the whole \$400,000,000 that is excess in unobligated balances over the figure that the Mutual Security people gave to the Foreign Affairs Committee. There is no sense in our giving them money to spend when we know they cannot obligate it.

There is also involved the question of administrative expense. They are planning to use approximately \$42,000,000 that this bill provides in United States funds and upward of \$30,000,000 in counterpart funds that are available to us on account of the things that the governments of these different countries have sold to their own people.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman is giving an excellent analysis of the various items in this bill, a comprehensive analysis I may say, but, I want to get clear in my mind just exactly what we are doing and what is before us. This is an appropriation bill to cover authorizations we have already made, is it not?

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. MASON. It is an appropriation bill that covers an authorization for mutual security of about \$6,400,000,000, is it not?

Mr. TABER. Six and one-quarter billions.

Mr. MASON. Then if a Member voted against the mutual security authorization, to be consistent he should vote against this appropriation bill, is that right?

Mr. TABER. That would depend on how he felt. Those who feel that they should be consistent undoubtedly might feel obliged to do so. There is, however, one thing involved that is different from the authorization bill, and I would not want anyone to take that position without thoroughly understanding it. We have in this bill various sums for the

Atomic Energy Commission and for the Defense Department, and they run into approximately \$4,000,000,000, and the question whether they would really want to vote against the bill with those items in it might be something that would temper their judgment.

Mr. MASON. That is the point I want to make. We have some things in this bill we want to vote for, but we have got some things in this bill that we do not want to vote for, and we have got to swallow it all in order to vote for the things we want. Now, I think that it is a mistake to bring before this House a mutual security appropriation that a good many of us have been opposed to and tie it up with some of the things that are necessary.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I ask the gentleman if it is not also true that the funds authorized for mutual security have been reduced a quarter of a billion dollars, and the amount in this bill is a quarter of a billion dollars less than the amount authorized.

Mr. TABER. That is true. On the other hand, we have failed to take the additional \$200,000,000 reduction that the hearings indicate should be taken, and we have not reduced the administrative expenses in the way that they should be reduced. That administrative proposition is one of the most serious things of the lot, because we have a good many buildings with an enormous number of employees drawing enormous salaries. Why, one fellow came over here, after he had been over there for a couple of years, who had been drawing pay and allowances and all that sort of thing, to the tune of about \$18,000 a year. He had been allowed to buy army gasoline at 15 cents a gallon without paying any tax and had been able to sport around in a Cadillac automobile. He had four or five servants. Maybe that is the way to do it. When you get those stories you can understand why it is that these spread eagle performances are getting us in bad with the people over there and are creating more ill will for us in a good many cases than the good will the expenditure of this money produces. That thing ought to be stopped.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman give the Committee the benefit of his conclusions as to how much this administrative cost can be reduced?

Mr. TABER. I would not want to go into that particularly because I have not had the opportunity to study it that other people, like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] have had, and I think he will be able to elaborate on it. I have just tried to call attention to the seriousness of these grants for large administrative expenditures.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know who is going to be the Administrator of this fund?

Mr. TABER. Well, we have an incompetent one this year.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The present Administrator is running all over the country now seeking the Democratic nomination for the Presidency.

Mr. TABER. He does not seem to be as much interested in his job as he is in trying to find something else.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will it not be possible somewhere in this legislation to make sure that he either continue in that capacity, or resign; one or the other?

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not know what you can do in this bill on that, because I do not know what kind of an amendment might be possible.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. On page 21 of the bill, under Chapter 9, Mutual Security, title I, Department of Defense, I note that it states on line 21, "travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized," and so forth, "at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals."

I want to ask the gentleman if that is not excessive. Are we going to allow folks traveling at the rate of \$50 a day?

Mr. TABER. It is more than you and I would expect to have to figure.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Is that subject to an amendment at the proper time?

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I wanted to ask a question on the atomic energy program, as to the effect of the cuts on that program, but first, since the name of the Mutual Security Director has come up, I might say to the House that I have heard no criticism of his actions as Mutual Security Director, and I believe, as well as the entire Committee on Foreign Affairs, regardless of party, I think that he has done a good job.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I do not think the gentleman is well posted. If the Committee on Foreign Affairs believes that, I do not believe they are. Frankly, I cannot go much further in yielding at this time or taking much more time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield any further to the gentleman because I have demonstrated beyond question in my mind what the situation is.

I do feel that there are some things in these emergency agencies that stick out like a sore thumb, and that we ought to do something about them before we get through.

The Small Defense Plants Administration was given \$3,000,000 in a revolving fund, which is absolutely unnecessary. They were given \$3,500,000 for administrative expenses, which is way beyond what ought to be allowed.

I do not know what the committee is going to propose with reference to the price-control set-up and the materials

control set-up in the controls bill. We probably will not know until we get to reading the bill and until the situation becomes a little bit more apparent as to what the conference might do, if we can find out anything about it before we get to that point in the bill. There is nothing in the bill at the present time for either set-up.

I think that is all I care to say at the present time.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office appropriations, I desire to call the attention of the members to the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation appears in this supplemental bill because at the time we considered the regular bill a new Administrator had just been appointed for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We postponed consideration to give the new Administrator an opportunity to familiarize himself with the duties of his office, and the needs of the Corporation.

This, however, is not an appropriation from the Treasury. It is a limitation upon the amount which the corporation can spend from its own receipts for administrative purposes. The amount is considerably reduced. It is \$2,250,000 below this year, and \$1,350,000 below the estimate.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take the rest of my time to announce the distressing news of the death of Mr. A. W. Heinmiller, executive secretary of our committee. Mr. Heinmiller exemplified the very high type of men we have on the staff of the Committee on Appropriations. He had been assistant superintendent of schools for the District of Columbia. Many of the members of Congress will remember him because of his appearances before congressional committees in support of the schools of the District of Columbia.

He served with signal ability as executive secretary of our subcommittee. He was an indefatigable worker, a thorough investigator, and a careful analyst of facts. Even when his health was failing, he made an extensive trip on behalf of the committee to obtain first-hand information for our deliberations. Bert, as he was familiarly called, will be sorely missed by our committee, and the entire Nation will be the worse off because of his passing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, a considerable portion of this bill is for military public works. Of course, we have to have men and we have to have equipment, and we must have bases from which to operate if we are to have an effective national defense program. The Committee on Appropriations has been performing a very fine work, in my judgment, in connection with the military construction program. Mr. RILEY of South Carolina began in January to conduct an investigation of military public works. He was assisted on the subcommittee by Mr. FURCOLO and Mr. GLENN

DAVIS. For weeks and months they carried on an investigation of our public works program. They conducted weeks of hearings on the North African base situation, for example, and voluminous testimony was presented. As a result of the long and arduous work of this subcommittee on military public works, and the work of our full subcommittee on defense appropriations it is my judgment that many millions of dollars will be saved and have been saved. Our public works program is being streamlined and nonessential frills are being eliminated from military public works. I think Mr. RILEY, Mr. FURCOLO, and Mr. DAVIS should be commended for the fine work they have done, together with the investigators who have worked with them in this program, and the very able committee staff.

When it came to marking up the military public works portion of this bill, the entire subcommittee on defense appropriations participated. Not only did they participate in the mark-up, but they also participated in the hearings presided over by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee, on the items which are contained in this bill. So the bill does contain the best judgment of the special Subcommittee on Public Works as well as the entire Subcommittee on Military Appropriations.

We realize we live in a dangerous world, and that a certain minimum base structure for the Army, Navy, and Air Force is absolutely essential. We have been disappointed at the slowness with which the public works program has moved forward. In my judgment the military build-up is proceeding too slowly and there is every reason why more rapid progress should be made to increase our military strength. This is no time for complacency.

We have given the defense establishment adequate funds since Korea for implementations of the public works program, but defense officials have been rather slow in doing their planning and actually getting construction. However, they are now moving along fairly well. It is not the desire of the committee, and it is not the desire of the Congress, in my judgment, to retard the military public works program. We need more, not less, action. We have made reductions in the budget estimate in excess of \$800,000,000, but those reductions were made largely after consultation with defense officials and after they, themselves, generally agreed that this reduction would not impede our military build-up.

So under all the facts and circumstances, it seems to me that the military public-works portion of the bill should be fully supported by the Congress. As I have said, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] and the other two Members whose names I referred to, the Military Public Works Subcommittee, are more informed as to all the details, and will discuss some of the details with the House. I believe the disposition of the House will be to go along with the committee on this program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 28 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

(Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the over-all expenditure for the purposes of foreign aid since the termination of World War II amounts, as of December 31, 1951, to \$35,500,000,000.

You will find a breakdown by program and by country at page 319 of the hearings.

If we add to that figure the amount expended since that date, the amount in the pipeline, and the amount carried in this bill, the over-all total reaches a figure well over \$50,000,000,000.

This bill which carries funds for 60 different nations the world over carries a total of \$6,275,000,000, \$30,000,000 for Austria, Germany, and the Ryukyu Islands; the balance for the countries under the Mutual Security Act, as amended.

I call attention to page 290 of the hearings which lists the countries which are to receive aid, and the type of aid they are to receive.

This bill is a one-package bill providing for military aid, for defense-support aid, for bilateral technical aid under the Mutual Security Administration, for bilateral technical aid under the State Department, for multilateral technical aid under the United Nations, and for miscellaneous items.

Your committee received requests in respect to Austria amounting to \$9,887,000 as compared with \$9,097,000 in the present year, this figure being composed of \$3,675,000 and \$6,212,000—the dollar equivalent of Austrian schillings.

The committee has reduced the dollar figure by \$372,500 and has placed a ceiling on the foreign currency that may be utilized, which should be adequate to carry on the program requested.

The committee also received requests in respect to Germany amounting to an over-all figure of \$47,833,000 as compared with \$100,933,000 in this fiscal year, made up of \$16,700,000 and the dollar equivalent in deutschmarks of \$31,133,000.

The committee has effected a reduction of \$1,127,500, and, again, has placed a ceiling on the use of foreign currency which should be adequate to carry on the requested program.

The request for the Ryukyus amounting to \$11,810,000 has been reduced to \$11,000,000.

For the Mutual Security Administration the bill carries \$6,245,000,000 as compared with \$7,378,000,000 in the present fiscal year, a reduction of \$250,000,000 under the figure in the recent authorization legislation, a reduction of about \$1,750,000,000 under the original request by the President.

Compared with the original request the amount now recommended reflects an over-all reduction of about 21 percent.

The cuts effected by your committee are three in number:

First, there is a reduction of \$200,000,000 due to an admitted increase in unobligated balances as of June 30 of a minimum of \$270,000,000 and a maximum of \$408,000,000.

Second, there is a reduction of \$45,000,000 in respect to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency which clearly has no need for the money in view of the unexpended balances on hand.

Third, there is a reduction of \$5,300,000 in respect to the three appropriations already referred to for Austria, Germany, and the Ryukyus.

You will find a breakdown by title on page 47 of the report, and breakdowns by activity and country within titles in other tables in the report.

On page 297 of the hearings you will find a statement of the unobligated and unexpended balances. You will note that the unobligated balances as of June 30, 1952, amount to \$809,000,000 at a minimum and that the unexpended balances amount to about \$9,700,000,000.

When we say that this bill carries an appropriation of \$6,245,000,000 for the Mutual Security Administration, plus \$30,000,000 in respect to Austria, Germany, and the Ryukyus, we should not lose sight of the \$809,000,000 of unexpended balances and of \$200,000,000 more which is authorized to be made available from items considered excess to our needs. If these items be included, the amount really authorized by this bill is not \$6,245,000,000, but, rather, \$7,254,000,000 for the Mutual Security Administration, plus \$30,000,000 for Austria, Germany and the Ryukyus.

We should also have in mind the transfer clauses in this legislation.

You will recall that there is authority among others to transfer 10 percent in title I for military aid to defense support aid or vice versa.

There is also authority to transfer 10 percent as between titles provided the transfer is made from military aid to military aid, or from economic aid to economic aid.

Both of these transfer authorities were utilized in the current fiscal year in respective amounts of \$478,000,000 and \$153,000,000.

It should also be noted that there has been a substantial slippage in the program of deliveries contemplated.

A letter which I have received from the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense dated June 21, 1952, indicates that it was estimated in September of 1951, that shipments of materials to all countries cumulative through June 1952, would aggregate \$5,300,000,000, and that the present estimate of expenditures for all countries through June 30, 1952, is approximately \$2,700,000,000. In other words, on that basis there has been a slippage in delivery of almost 50 percent.

Attention should also be called to the fact that relief from tax provisions in other countries should represent a very substantial increase in funds available.

I also suggest in passing that there is something like 25 percent of the total

military request which is for spare parts. This seems to the nonexpert to be a very high percentage.

Furthermore in computing economic aid those making the calculations have been very liberal in my judgment in respect to the gold and dollar balances which have been allowed to be retained by the recipient nations.

By a curious coincidence, the over-all figure resulting from the Lisbon Conference late in February, supposed to determine the needs of the recipient countries, was identical with the figure in the President's budget submitted to the Congress early in January.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

I want to make a few general observations Mr. Chairman.

COMMITTEE HANDICAPS

In the first place, the committee this year has again worked under severe handicap.

There have been constant changes in figures.

Only last Tuesday at the mark-up of the bill there was a revision upwards in unobligated balances as of June 30, 1952, of from \$270,000,000 to \$408,000,000.

Only a few days before that we had a revision upward in unexpended balances as of the same date of \$550,000,000. If you will look at the month-by-month obligations and expenditures appearing in a table in the hearings at page 313, you will note a tremendous variation as between months and the apparent rush to obligate and spend money during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

You will note that 43 percent of the funds available at the time were obligated in May and June of 1951.

If you will look at part 2 of the hearings in which the errors referred to are discussed, you will find that between June 4 and June 24 of this year the committee received three official guesses as to funds to be obligated in the month of May; first \$1,100,000,000, second \$1,074,000,000 and third, the actual obligation figure of \$352,000,000.

You will also note a report by a representative of the General Accounting Office to the effect that the method of obligating used "would permit the obligation to be recorded and later canceled" and also "to obligate for one type of item in stock, and later change to another type of item after a contract has been entered into."

It appears in one instance that \$300,000,000 was obligated in March, deobligated in April, and reobligated in June.

In dealing with military items, Mr. Chairman, which represented the great bulk of the request, the committee was given two secret sheets showing end items contemplated by major category and by dollar equivalent country by country. The committee was also given secret lists of programs by the three armed services for the several countries.

But, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to passing upon the alleged deficiencies, or upon tables of organization, or upon the enormous percentage of spare parts, to which I have referred, the committee has been forced to take on faith the determinations of the various military ad-

visory set-ups on the other side of the water.

Similarly when it comes to unit costs the committee has been forced to take on faith the findings of the Department of Defense.

I suggest that tables of organization and unit costs require careful examination by Representatives of the Congress.

Let me quote briefly from the hearings at pages 363 and 366:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You have given us, also off the record, a breakdown of items included in the proposed Air Force program for fiscal 1953 with unit costs for certain of the items.

I do not suppose that there is any way in the world that this committee can be given any understanding as to how those figures were arrived at. We have no indication of what is available or what is needed, and we are simply asked to take it on faith that the various items are required for the forces in being, and that the unit costs in each case are fairly determined. Is not that about the situation, Colonel?

Colonel KLEIN. That is the situation with regard to cost of the items, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. With regard to the requirements, these are stated deficiencies that have come in, as we outlined to you last year when we were here, and as General Olmsted outlined yesterday as to how the deficiency lists are prepared. These figures are based on those deficiency lists which have been screened by country teams and by JAMAG.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is no way in the world for this committee to check those determinations. We simply have to accept them on faith as well as the determination of costs as I see it. Would you disagree with that, Colonel?

Colonel KLEIN. No, sir.

I may add, Mr. Chairman, that the testimony given by the military was largely off the record and therefore of no value for presentation here.

In dealing with defense support aid and economic aid, the committee was again asked to rely on the yardstick of balance of payments, coupled with a new multiplier formula which seems to be sheer guesswork.

The balance of payments formula, at best, is an estimate, it is dependent largely upon local policies, and it results only in so-called illustrative programs which have no binding effect on anyone.

I often recall the words of a distinguished financier in Europe who said to me some years ago, "If you will guarantee to meet the adverse balance of payments in any country in Europe, and will let me control the fiscal policy of that country, I will guarantee to show you an adverse balance of payments."

A short while ago I inserted in the RECORD an article from a magazine called the Tablet, published in London. Under date of May 24 it discussed the coal situation in England. It pointed out that—

Coal is the only raw material which could be produced in this country [Great Britain] in such quantity that there is a substantial surplus available for export. Last year it fell to 3.5 percent of the total output of the mines.

* * * Up to the outbreak of the last war, over a period of some 60 years, Britain supplied many countries of Europe with coal, particularly France and Italy, as well as countries farther afield like Argentina. The sur-

plus available for export reached a record of 75,000,000 tons in the early 1920's, of which more than four-fifths went to Europe.

The export of even half this volume today would solve our balance-of-payments problems for many years to come and, incidentally, would release many goods for the home market now being sent abroad, and so help raise our standard of living. But, probably more important than this, it would provide a much-needed blood transfusion for the sick economies of our western allies.

It went on to state that—

During 1951, serious consequences were averted only by resorting to imports from the United States, which, after having fallen away to nothing in 1950, rose during the following year to no less than 26,000,000 tons, of which Britain had the ignominy to account for 1,000,000.

It added that—

Since 1947, some 18,000 foreign workers have been placed in the mines. These figures look ludicrously small compared with, say, Belgium, where in 1951 no less than 66,000 workers from other European countries were at work in her mines, representing two-fifths of her total manpower.

This is just one example of local conditions or policies which directly affect the yardstick used in determining the amount of defense aid to be furnished.

The truth of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is we just have not had the facts. We should have, and that if we had them we could not present them to the House.

The task of intelligent analysis and proper supervision is impossible without the aid of expert investigators.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in section 4 of this bill on page 33, line 15, the children's emergency fund:

For contributions authorized by section 12 of the mutual security aid bill, \$16,481,000.

That is foreign aid for children, is it not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is the amount requested for the agency in which the lady is interested. The amount was allowed in full.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Has the gentleman been able to arrive at any figure as to the cost per child for such care as may be necessary?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think those figures have been available in other years. I am not sure that they appear in this year's hearings.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. I am interested in this particular section, and I would like to tell you of a situation which I think is of interest in connection with this bill. I belong to an adult Sunday school class here in the city. A few weeks ago we had a woman missionary as our speaker, and she urged us to contribute to the care of these children. She told us that they, as missionaries could feed, house, clothe and educate a child in India and those other Asian countries for 20 cents per day. Could the administrators of this part of the Mutual Security Act do the same for the same amount of money?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not believe they could, and I think there has been considerable question raised as to whether this is the most effective way to carry out the laudable objectives the Agency had in mind.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. In view of that fact, has any thought ever been given to designating the missionaries of the various churches, under perhaps the Federal Council of Churches, or if not that, perhaps the organization of Quakers, to handle this mutual security fund for these children and other distressed peoples? They, by reason of their years of experience, and their financial background, or lack of financial background, I might say, could do it for much less.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot say to the gentlewoman whether these specific suggestions have or have not been considered. I know various alternatives have been considered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Just by way of explaining the International Children's Fund, it is a fund to which we only make our contribution. Other countries contribute their money and materials. It is a cooperative venture. The cost per day per child is in cents and very low, in addition it is supplementary help in the main.

In addition, the job that is being done is a world-wide job. There are organizations of the type to which the gentlewoman referred which are, I believe, anxious to see the International Children's Fund carried on and are cooperating in its work. It has generally been considered a very constructive effort by the United Nations in cooperation in the free world. Certainly, it is basically appealing field and is building helpful human relations and sound youth in many areas.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Does the gentleman think we should endeavor to have such a setup carried in this bill?

Mr. JAVITS. I think if the gentlewoman will study the full record before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which can easily be made available, she will find her objectives are being fully served. The question of turning this over to particular religious groups has been thoroughly explored. They just do not have the coverage. They do a fine job in places A, B or C, but they just do not have the coverage to do the job which is being done by the International Children's Fund. Many of the organizations themselves are very much in favor of carrying it on in this fashion. I think the gentlewoman will find all of that spelled out in the testimony before our committee.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. It seems to me we should have some sort of organization that could do it for less money.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In the mutual security bill I sponsored an amendment which as amended cut the administrative personnel 5 percent. I wonder how you would adjust that 5-percent cut in personnel in the total administrative funds made available in the act. On page 36, I notice a provision for \$42,000,000 for administrative expenses. Could the able gentleman explain to the House the amount of money actually cut on the basis of that amendment?

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield, the estimated amount allowed in the bill deducted from the administrative expenses because of the Ribicoff amendment was \$1,735,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield further, the trouble with that is that it is supposed to be 5 percent out of forty-odd-million dollars, and 5 percent of forty would be \$2,000,000. I do not understand how it could be \$1,000,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The original request for administrative expenses, after applying the Ribicoff amendment was for \$43,790,000, plus the dollar equivalent of \$30,719,500 local currency, or a total of \$74,509,000. That compares with \$69,949,000 in the current fiscal year, and is an increase of 6.6 percent.

The \$43,790,000 has been reduced to \$42,000,000 by the amendment of the committee.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it the intention of the gentleman to offer an amendment cutting this sum further?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I believe that an amendment will be offered with that end in view.

Mr. RIBICOFF. My comment is that my original amendment, after deep study of this subject, indicated that the administrative personnel not only for the amount of money saved, but for the benefit of American foreign policy could be cut a minimum of 15 percent. The committee then adopted a 10-percent cut, which the House went along with. In conference the conferees cut that to 5 percent. Now it is my feeling that a minimum 15-percent cut in administrative personnel would make a much more effective program than the program contemplated today.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. My own judgment is that the Agency has been very much overmanned for years, both abroad and at home. I think a further reduction should be made in the request for administrative expenditure, and that a ceiling of some kind should be placed on the use of local currencies for that purpose.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. With further reference to UNICEF the International Children's Emergency Fund, I think the gentlewoman from Michigan would be interested to know that this particular agency, in my opinion, represents the classic example of self-perpetuation of an agency which is cre-

ated for an express emergency purpose, and then later is found almost impossible to get rid of. In the hearings on the International Children's Emergency Fund in 1950, every agency concerned agreed, including the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to terminate the International Children's Emergency Fund on June 30, 1951. On June 30, 1951, they were back again, and they are back again this year, and I dare say we will have this particular fund with us from now until Gabriel blows his horn because once you get one of these things, you are never able to get rid of it.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. I notice in the bill on page 12 the committee has provided \$1,400,000,000 for expansion of the atomic-energy program. In reading the hearings I notice they ask for almost twice that amount. I would like to inquire of the gentleman, because I think this is the most essential part of the bill and the most essential part of our defense program, if the committee feels that that sum is sufficient for the Atomic Energy Commission to go forward with the expansion program?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That item was not included among the items considered by the subcommittees on which I have been serving. I think perhaps some member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee or perhaps the chairman can answer better than I can.

Mr. TABER. I think I can answer the gentleman. The Atomic Energy Commission came before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and they had no justifications for the money at all except that they wanted it. They had no plans as to what they were going to build or as to how they were going to use it. The committee figured out how much it was that they could possibly contract for or use, and the committee gave them what they figured they could possibly use. In other words, \$7,000,000 was every cent that they figured that they could use, and then they gave them double. That is the reason that it is not more. To give them more money would just mean that it would be wasted like a lot of the money that they have had before.

Mr. GOLDEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I notice in the bill also that the Tennessee Valley Authority is granted \$150,000,000, and in the report they state that all of this expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority is to create electricity to be used by the Atomic Energy Commission; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is what they say, but I do not believe that is accurate, because I understand the local power outfits are prepared to take on the burden. That is the way I understand it. I do not have all the detail of that available at the moment, but that is the way I understand it.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority, its facilities are being expanded to provide a portion of the power to be used at the new site to

be constructed by the Atomic Energy Commission. The amount that is requested in this bill is for new plants to generate electricity to serve the Atomic Energy Commission's new site. There will be private utilities also which will enter into contracts with the Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of facilities under private ownership, which would, in turn, serve that new site as well.

Mr. GOLDEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. After closely scrutinizing the report, it indicates that all of this new electricity will go into the Atomic Energy plants, those that are to be built, the one at Oak Ridge and the one at Paducah, Ky. Is that correct?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

(Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks immediately after the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. FLOOD. I wish to observe, with reference to the gentleman's comment on the exportation of coal by Great Britain, that just this very week the British interior people have released figures which indicate a great increase in the export of coal from Britain for dollars. I think that is an increasing indication of their awareness of the necessity for the export of coal and the month-by-month British export and obtaining of dollars for the purpose the gentleman suggested as being accomplished by the British mines.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am very glad to hear this.

FURTHER GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

I want now, Mr. Chairman, to refer very briefly to certain other general observations and suggestions.

My first observation was in respect to the handicaps under which the committee has been compelled to work.

END ITEMS

Second. End items for our defense agencies and for the Mutual Security Administration are identical in character, and come from identical firms under identical procurement procedure. They are all for the purposes of our national defense. Their ultimate destination is controlled by Department of Defense officials. It would seem that presentation of all programs to one subcommittee would be advisable in the interest of over-all consideration.

OFFSHORE PROCUREMENT

Third. If Europe is ever to be self-supporting it must be put in a position to produce end items for itself. It is hoped that greater progress than that achieved to date will be achieved in the field of offshore procurement.

NONGOVERNMENT FINANCING

Fourth. Very little foreign financing is contemplated by the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank or private financing. It is believed that allied cooperation could materially increase this type

of financing and that this coupled with expenditure for infra-structure and other military purposes should materially reduce the need for defense support.

SPAIN

Fifth. One hundred million dollars was made available for Spain in the fiscal year 1952. Twenty-five million dollars more is carried in this bill. Not one cent has been obligated to date. The excuse given is pending negotiations. A comparison of the time involved in negotiations with Yugoslavia 1 year ago is striking.

BILATERAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Sixth. Bilateral technical assistance is still carried on by two Government agencies, the State Department and the Mutual Security Administration. Consolidation would seem to be desirable with a view to eliminating duplication and assuring efficiency.

MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Seventh. Multilateral technical assistance is carried on by the United Nations in 55 different countries. Duplication of effort would seem almost inevitable and the share of the over-all cost for the United States seems to run in certain instances as high as 60 percent.

PROGRESS

The Committee will find on pages 320 and 321 of the hearings, two tables. The first shows the gross national product and percentage used for military expenditure in all countries involved, including America, for the fiscal years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953. The second shows the population and the percentage of men in the active forces for all countries including America.

The United States percentage is the largest in both tables.

But there is a steady increase in allied percentages which it is hoped will continue to increase.

The trend is reflected in increased military budgets, in increased periods of compulsory service, and in specific progress toward definite goals in terms of military divisions, naval forces, and air wings.

A long step in terms of cooperation will also be reflected, assuming ratification in the Schumann plan, the European Defense Community, and the proposed plan for greater federalization submitted in about 6 months.

CONCLUSION

The over-all policy in respect to the fiscal year 1953, Mr. Chairman, has been determined by the authorization legislation recently enacted into law.

There are differences of opinion in respect to that policy on both sides of the aisle.

I happen to be one who has been and is in accord with its major objectives.

Our mission to Europe, until recently under General Eisenhower, seems to me to be vitally important from the standpoint of national defense, not only to this country but to the entire free world.

If successful, it is clear that we can equip and maintain essential military power in Europe far more cheaply than in America.

If successful, our allies should soon be in a position to take off our shoulders the present tremendous burden in money and manpower.

In the light of progress to date it is vitally important in my judgment not to do anything at this time which could jeopardize possible success.

This does not mean that I believe in pouring billions of dollars every year into 60 different nations of the world.

It just cannot be done.

We can easily spend ourselves and our allies into destruction as Lenin once predicted.

We should not spend one dollar more than is essential to major objectives.

We are between the devil and the deep blue sea—between the armed might of the Kremlin and its satellites, and the threat of destructive Nation-wide inflation.

The task of statesmanship is to steer a course between the two.

I believe the committee recommendations are fully justified.

I repeat, however, Mr. Chairman, that thorough and intelligent analysis and proper supervision of this tremendous expenditure can only be achieved under present conditions with the aid of adequate staffs of expert investigators, working the year round, responsible to the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate and to them only.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, while it may be true, as just stated by the gentleman from New York, that the Atomic Energy Commission did not submit to this honorable committee detailed figures concerning their entire plan for expansion, I do believe that the evidence heard before this committee and which I took the time to read yesterday afternoon and last night, shows they do have a well defined, comprehensive program for expansion not only of the present atomic energy plants at Oak Ridge, Paducah, and other places but in addition to this they have plans for a new plant that will, in my opinion, when carried out give more security to this country than any other one step that we can take.

It is further my opinion that the possession of the atomic bomb stayed the hand of Russia and prevented world war III from breaking out over the past 2 years. It is now reported that Russia has the atomic bomb, but thanks to the ingenuity of the scientists of America and the industry and patriotism of the Atomic Energy Commission and their staff, it is reported in the public press that this Commission has now developed a whole family of new atomic ammunition and weapons that can place us again far ahead of any other world power in this new development and if we have the wisdom and courage to support this expansion program of the Atomic Energy Commission we can be assured that it will do more than any other one thing to prevent world war III and secure the peace of the world.

In these modern times the two things which America needs to do in my humble opinion is to expand our air power and expand our atomic weapons program.

There are many provisions in this bill appropriating money that I am opposed to because of the great burden upon the taxpayers of this country. If we cut down anywhere, we ought to cut somewhere else other than in the item providing for an expansion of the atomic energy program.

As I pointed out a moment ago, the money to be appropriated in this bill for an expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority power plants is to create electricity all of which will be used by the new atomic-energy plant and by those already in existence.

Some objection has been voiced to this expansion of electric power by the TVA. Ordinarily, I would go along with them, but the report of the committee shows clearly that these two programs are tied together that you cannot have an expanded atomic energy program unless you have additional electric power to run it, and it further shows that all of the contemplated increase in electric energy is to be used by the Atomic Energy Commission in prosecuting the development of new weapons for the defense of this country and the peace of the world.

It appears, in the report and hearings before this honorable committee that it is proposed to build new electric generating plants at least one of which will probably be located near Rogersville, Ten. The reports say that this selection is being considered so that this steam-generating plant can use coal from the eastern bituminous-coal fields in Kentucky and some neighboring States. Everybody knows that you can transport electric energy much cheaper than you can transport coal. It would appear to me that it would be feasible and cheaper to locate some new steam-generating plants in southeast Kentucky where the chief item of expense, namely coal, could be had without much transportation costs.

However, I know that I cannot control the location of any of these plants. I can only advance the arguments in favor of that section of the United States which I have the honor to represent. The paramount purpose of all of us is to have the steam generating plants and the new atomic energy plant located where they can be constructed at the smallest cost and where everything considered, they can render the greatest service to the entire country.

However, it has been made to clearly appear in my appearance before the Atomic Energy Commission that southeast Kentucky has all of the necessary raw material—coal in abundance, which is the chief item of cost, plenty of water, thousands upon thousands of unemployed skilled and unskilled labor, and a patriotic people that would give as great a degree of cooperation in the construction and operation of such plants as could be found anywhere else in the United States.

It is expected that Congress will either recess or adjourn in about 10 days. If we adjourn, we will be out of session for approximately 6 months. In this time of crisis and tension, when the peace of the world is hanging in the balance, we

should not lose this time and provision should now be made to build up as rapidly as we can the defense of this country. It will be far cheaper for us to so strengthen and arm ourselves so as to maintain the peace of the world than for us to be derelict in our duty and allow the ruthless dictators to precipitate world war III. If this war comes, to win it would cause much misery, suffering, and death; also, it would take enormous expenditure of funds to prosecute such a war. It appears to me, from a purely economic standpoint, that we cannot afford to miss this opportunity to go rapidly forward with our defense preparations.

More money is appropriated in the bill for the Mutual Security Program abroad and for many other programs than is provided in the bill for the expansion of the atomic-energy program. If we have to cut anywhere in order to economize, we certainly should not cut or reduce the appropriations provided for this essential expansion of the atomic-energy program.

I have steadfastly voted for economy in all nonessential expenditures, but I am opposed to any reduction in the amount provided by this honorable committee to furnish us with the one thing that we are superior in—the atomic bomb and the many other recent developments along this line.

In reading the evidence heard before this committee, I was happy to find that the Atomic Energy Commission is trying to obtain all necessary electric power from private industry. It appears in these hearings that they have invited private industry, which creates electric power to furnish any part or all of the energy necessary to operate the new plant. This is wholesome. Private industry should be given this work if it can and will furnish the necessary power to operate the new contemplated plant.

The amount of money asked for the creation of a new steam generating plant by the TVA, as I understand it, is to be used only if private industry cannot furnish the necessary power to supply the new atomic-energy plant. We should always let private industry do everything that it possibly can and resort only to publicly owned power when we cannot obtain the necessary power from private industry.

Furthermore, it is far better if plants are built, to build steam generating plants. This stimulates and helps the coal industry. The coal industry of the entire United States, and especially in Kentucky, is suffering from one of the worst depressions in many years. Anything that is reasonably possible to be done to cause more production of coal and to give men work should be done in this particular. These hearings do not disclose where the new atomic-energy plant may be located. For security reasons, none of us know where it will finally be built.

It is referred to in the hearings as location No. 3. Of course, the paramount consideration is to place the new plant where it will best serve our defense program, but I do wish to point out again that from all the information that I have

been able to obtain, southeast Kentucky affords as good a location as could be found anywhere else in the United States.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of placing in the RECORD my objections to the cut made by the Committee on Appropriations in the mutual-security fund of some \$250,000,000.

I am aware that \$45,000,000 of that fund is for the Korean aid, for rehabilitation, and that there is merit to the fact that the problem is not proximate, and that it could be delayed.

I am aware, as well, that the most of the balance of the cut is because of very creditable examinations and investigations made by the staff of the committee, and particularly of the subcommittee under the jurisdiction of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], to show the failure to properly commit and obligate funds, particularly by the Air Force, and also the other military agencies. But, Mr. Chairman, the authorization bill from the great Foreign Affairs Committee of this House was recently on this floor, and I sat on this floor during every minute of several days of serious debate on that bill. Both sides of the aisle devoted themselves to that debate. Amendment after amendment was offered for the purpose of further cutting the foreign-aid bill. This House, after serious consideration, prevented any further cuts, and now at the last minute two hundred and fifty additional million dollars has been taken from these funds.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that global warfare should be reduced to the concept of some one town in some one state; certainly I do not believe that global warfare and these extremely delicate relations between the nations of the world today can be conducted by slide-rule computation or by rule of thumb; certainly I do not think that one committee or one subcommittee, and certainly not one Member or more on this floor, can decide to ration the number of shells being fired by the artillery or determine here in his omnipotence the number of missions to be flown by aircraft or some fighters or bombers based at the front lines.

Mr. Chairman, I have observed, after several years in this House, that when matters dealing with agriculture are before this body most of it is left to the men from the agricultural districts and the Committee on Agriculture, and we sit by, except for two or three sidewalk farmers from some big city or other, but generally we will yield to the knowledge and understanding of the agricultural problem to the men on this floor who come from those districts, who have been born and raised with the problem, and who understand it. But, Mr. Chairman, I have never failed to support the recommendations of the agriculturalists in this House. Sometimes I have acted with an abundance of caution, but I have acted.

Whenever there is a question here dealing with the Department of the In-

terior, reclamation, or whatever those vast problems may be, we let the specialists from those areas and from that committee present the case, and we act accordingly; and invariably we follow the recommendation of the men in this House who live with the problem, who sit on these committees, who hear the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes additional time?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the question of agriculture, we from the cities have supported them, and we do not hear any claims of socialism; but when something in the nature of public housing comes up they cry out: Socialistic public housing!

Mr. FLOOD. I, of course, hasten to agree with the distinguished Majority Leader. I was not talking about that thing just at this moment, but he was. It certainly is a one-way street; of that there is no doubt.

During the last 2 or 3 days in the course of the debate on the extension of the Defense Production Act I have heard distinguished Members from agricultural districts, after we had knocked our brains out in the city districts supporting their agricultural authorizations and appropriation bills here in the committees, they came on the floor and took over for 3 or 4 days with amendments to control salaries and wages in the great industrial areas of the Nation. That has been going on for years and I do not hope to change it, but it is a one-way street, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

But to return to the problem I am addressing myself to, Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned some place before, and I think I will do it again for an emphatic purpose, two or three things that every man in this House thinks he can do better than anybody else. I refer to managing a baseball club, running a hotel and being an expert on international relations and foreign affairs. That seems to be a consistent fault with all of us. Now, for me to develop the deadly seriousness of the situation that exists in the world today would be gilding the lily. I am sincere in trying to determine if the House is seriously aware of what the situation is all over the world, north, south, east, and west. If the facts are true, as I think they are, it is inconceivable how we would persist in this ostrich-like policy of refusing to recognize those facts once they are identified. And may I add that this cut, with the exception of \$45,000,000 for Korean aid, is in the military end of the bill. You are cutting nearly \$200,000,000 from the military part of the bill.

I realize that you are sure you are all fully qualified and completely competent,

as are the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, I realize you all are positive you are fully competent to sit with all the high ranking military leaders of all the nations of the world and of the NATO conference; but to sharpen up your meat ax and to cut \$200,000,000 more off military aid just to show you can use your ax this morning is quite a desperate, a quite serious and a quite high questionable pastime. I hold no brief, Mr. Chairman, for the leaders of many of these nations who are supposed to be our friends. I doubt as seriously as do you if under certain circumstances they are or will be, but must you insist that your tail feathers have to be preened and that these people have to fall on your necks and tell you how much they love you and appreciate what you are doing? Of course, they will not do that. They are jealous, they are envious and have little affection for you. But the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, if I am the only man in the House who will raise my voice today against this cut I shall do so because I believe so deeply in the principle of this mutual-aid plan, I believe it is a serious error to make the cut and I shall object as strenuously as I can.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of this House to the new section 514 of the Mutual Security Agency's authorizing legislation which enlarges and expands on our Government's powers to develop and procure materials for the United States stockpile and for our allies. This new section authorizes the Director for Mutual Security to initiate and develop, wherever they may be located, new and expanded sources of supply of materials which are in short supply in any country receiving United States assistance. Operations under this section can thus contribute substantially to the security and strength of the free world and that of the United States.

Before speaking of the question of what this new section means, in detail, I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the Director for Mutual Security is called upon as in the past to carry out a vigorous program in association with Defense Materials Procurement Agency—DMPA—to develop new sources of materials which are in short supply in the United States. The Director will continue to make available counterpart to DMPA to obtain materials and expand production of these materials abroad which are needed by the United States.

The new section 514 of the Mutual Security Act enlarges and emphasizes the powers of the Director to promote increased production of materials in which our allies are deficient. He is called upon to find out what potential shortages might weaken collective security and he is authorized to assist in and initiate projects for expanding the production of materials to minimize such

shortages. The testimony of representatives of Mutual Security Agency who have come before us indicate that the Director intends to set aside such dollar funds as may be required for these purposes and for assisting, where appropriate, the improvement of transport and other facilities for carrying materials either to the United States or to our allies. It is further our understanding that the Director will use the United States Government-owned counterpart funds arising in accordance with section 115 (h) of the ECA Act of 1948, as amended, to make loans for the purposes of section 514, and that he will seek repayment of these loans in local currency or such other form as he considers advantageous to the United States.

This House should welcome this added concern for materials for the remainder of the free world. Any additions to the supplies of vital raw materials to our allies not only helps them to complete their vital rearmament tasks, but will tend to release other supplies of material for United States military and civilian production purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

(Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall confine my remarks here this morning to chapter 8 of the bill, the part which deals with the military public works program for the Department of Defense.

If you have availed yourself of the opportunity to look at the hearings which have been published you probably will feel, well, there have not been very many hearings, and I will grant you that the hearings that have been published are not voluminous. But, as a matter of fact, the bill and the report on chapter 8 represent results of hearings which started back early this year; hearings in connection with the investigation of the public works program of the Department of Defense under the chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY]. Those hearings were based on investigations that had been made by members of the Committee on Appropriations staff. The information thus obtained was assembled and presented to us by our very industrious and capable executive secretary of the subcommittee, John Donnally. Those hearings went on almost continuously from last February right until the time we started to hold the hearings that have been printed and are now available to you. As our report indicates, there will be published later the complete hearings on the investigation that we did make of the existing public works program, including the situation in North Africa.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of two more genial subcommittee members that anyone could work with than the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO]. I do not know of anyone who has worked harder in order to keep the committee work going than those two gentlemen have in the course of the last 4 or 5 months.

The appropriation for the Air Force portion of the public works program of necessity represents a new approach to appropriations this year, and that had to be done because the original approach that the Air Force used, the original presentation that was made to the subcommittee, simply was not made on a practical and usable basis. They came before us with a list of items that they wanted to build. Some of them were funded at 100 percent, some of them at 75 percent, and some at a less percentage, and if we had attempted to bring an appropriation bill to the floor of the House on that basis, we still would not have known what they were going to be able to build on any of the bases in accordance with the justifications that were submitted. They also presented to us, with respect to 10 overseas bases and a series of bases in the United Kingdom, completely fictitious justifications. Experience had demonstrated that a cost factor of 2.5 had to be used; in other words, that was the ratio of cost in those areas as compared to the cost that would be necessary for building in continental United States. So, when the Bureau of the Budget cut the amount that they requested for those bases, instead of deleting a single item in presenting that matter to our subcommittee, they fictitiously reduced that cost factor and came before us and said, "Well, this is not on the basis of 2.5; this is on the basis of 1.5, and that brings us within the dollar ceiling that the Bureau of the Budget set for us." It was artificial; they admitted it was artificial; they knew it could not be done on that basis, and every member of the subcommittee knew it could not be done on that basis. At that point we were all about ready to give up.

There was a widespread feeling that the only thing we could do would be to give the Air Force some advance planning money and tell them to go ahead and do some of the planning they needed in order to come in and present a program that meant something to the subcommittee. But you cannot build air bases that way. Some of the bases are already in progress. We are committed to the construction of them. There has already been too much indecision and too much delay in the construction of those bases. So a new approach was worked out through the cooperation of high officials of the Air Force. That was the approach that you will find outlined on pages 37 and 38 of the committee report, where we said to the Air Force:

We cannot tell just how much you ought to spend on any one of these bases you have listed. Your presentation to us has not been practical enough to permit us to do that. But we can pretty well decide, and we will expect you to present a program to us that will help to decide, how much, on an over-all basis, you ought to spend in the various categories of the construction program.

That is the basis of this appropriation and that is explained pretty well on those pages of the report.

Do not let anyone leave this Chamber today thinking that that is all, that that is the bite for the Air Force construction program during this fiscal year. Ac-

tually what is done here today represents merely a stopgap. The Air Force anticipates another appropriation prior to April 1 of next year. So that the bill here today represents a stopgap to carry us through on some kind of basis of surveillance until the Air Force comes back with a program that will mean something, so that appropriations can be made prior to April 1 of next year. So when you read the fact that a substantial cut has been made in the Air Force construction program do not subtract that from this year's appropriation because it merely means a deferral of the work that has to be done and will be done when the Air Force can submit a reasonable justification for it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Referring to page 37 of the committee report, do I correctly understand that the appropriation is in amounts for pavements, maintenance, land, and so forth? Is that the form of the appropriation?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. I thought the weakness was that the Air Force had given you a percentage figure—I attempted to read a little bit about it—where they had said, "We will build one-third of all the bases," and you had said, "It is better to have more finished bases than one-third finished bases all over the world," and tried to pin them down to a priority system. It seems to me this form of appropriation would be even more vague, in that it would permit all of this stuff to be spread out all over the world and might not complete any single base.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Except for the commitment that they are not to build half a runway or half a troop housing facility or half a shop and come back for more money for it. These are to be complete units that are to be done within the limits of this appropriation.

Mr. VORYS. Did the committee get a list of priorities? It seems to me there would be certain priorities as between all the desirable or convenient bases in the world.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We did not. We asked for that and we were unable to get it. I might say to the gentleman from Ohio that we have tried to protect Congress in this respect by requiring monthly reports to the committee outlining commitments made by bases and by categories.

With respect to the Army and the Navy the picture is a little more encouraging. They did have their justifications in shape that could be understood. They have done defense planning. Their program is firm so that they knew and we knew pretty much what they expected to do.

As far as the Army presentation was concerned, the cuts which were made are pretty well explained in the report. About the only basic complaint we had, I think, was that we felt a tendency there to put something in the category of classified, and then to clam up and not give the subcommittee the informa-

tion to which we are entitled. Some of these things have been the subject of magazine articles and newspaper articles, and it seems as if everybody else in the entire country has been able to learn something about these things except the committees of Congress. That was the difficulty we had with respect to the Army, but otherwise, as I say, they did present us with a pretty well firmed-up program.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Navy, there was one item, which, in my opinion, stood out like a sore thumb. It stood out like a sore thumb because the Navy in general and Admiral Jelley, the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in particular, has been very frank and candid with the subcommittee. Admiral Jelley has not only been frank and candid, but he has been cooperative and effective, and directly so, in connection with the attempt to enforce a measure of austerity in the Navy public works program. He issued orders and sent people out, and came back in and said, "Here is \$30,000,000 that we have already saved on the basis of recommendations that you have made." So that in general, his approach has been of the best. But then there came this item which stood out like a sore thumb, as I saw it. It is down here at Little Creek, Va., where they have the Navy amphibious training base. Last year they came in and got about \$100,000 to buy land. It is land that they had used on a lease basis during World War II. That is where they did most of their amphibious training during that time. This year they came back and said, "We are all right on this land now, but we need more." There were two parcels of about 30 or 35 acres each which were not too much out of line. But then they came in with the request for a 35-acre buffer area—35 acres at \$6,000 per acre adjacent to Virginia Beach. Now it may be that they have a need for this land. It may be that the facilities that they had during World War II are not adequate for this purpose. It may be that this is the only area on the Atlantic coast which would serve their purpose, but I do submit it was a complete lack of candor and a complete lack of fairness to the committee and the Congress that they did not inform us that that kind of request for 35 acres of land at \$6,000 per acre was coming in here at the time they received the \$100,000 appropriation last year. I think that is something that the House of Representatives is entitled to know, and perhaps do something about.

Mr. Chairman, this specific instance of land acquisition is illustrative of an over-all Defense Department problem. Last year the Congress appropriated enough money for the Defense Department to buy more land than there is in the whole State of Rhode Island. This year's request is for about one-third as much. I believe every member of our subcommittee strongly feels that there is a definite need for a study of the land holdings of the Department of Defense. Sometimes we wonder just how accurate an inventory of land holdings the Department of Defense itself has, but cer-

tainly there ought to be a study made to assure that land that the Department of Defense now has is properly utilized and the land which they are not using, and do not intend to use, will be disposed of so that it does not lie there as a dead drone on the taxpayers of this country. I strongly hope that before the Congress adjourns the Committee on Appropriations will authorize its staff to make an investigation, and that the results of that investigation will be made known to a proper subcommittee as the basis for hearings early in the Eighty-third Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there are mistakes in chapter 8 of this bill, I am sure. But I do believe that we can anticipate much better staff and committee surveillance of the program than has heretofore been the case. This required surveillance is most important. The work must go forward. There has already been too much indecision and delay.

We are in a position here today where it is our responsibility to provide a reasonable amount of money to permit the construction work to go forward under careful congressional scrutiny of the use of the funds appropriated. We may be disgusted with some of the things that have gone on, but our disgust will not build the installations that are required.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Military Construction brings to you today its recommendation for another payment for the expansion of the bases for our armed services. I am sure that every Member of this Congress realizes the importance of having an adequate base for the armed services. There are three projects that must go along in parallel order to develop a firm defense program. The end items must come off the production lines, such as tanks, planes, and things of that nature. The personnel to handle these items must be trained and bases must be developed on which they can operate and on which they can train and from which they can operate. No ship can sail without a proper harbor and maintenance facilities. No plane can fly without a base or an airport from which to fly. No infantry can be trained without a military base on which to train and to practice. So all of these things must be coordinated, and in order to keep up with the expanding program of our defense forces, we must continue to expand our base structure.

The Army and Navy are older services and their base structure is in better shape and more complete than is the Air Force. You will find in this public works bill that we have presented to you today for your consideration that the Army and Navy are largely expanding facilities on the bases which they already have. The Air Force needs more facilities. Their set-up in World War II was more or less temporary. Many of their bases have deteriorated to the point where they have to be absolutely rehabilitated in order to be usable.

I call your attention to one more factor in regard to the Air Force. On July 1, 1950, we had 48 wings. The Chiefs of Staff and the President and the Congress agreed that it should be expanded to an ultimate of 95 wings. During the past 2 years we have been engaged in building the Air Force up to these 95 wings. Since the 1952 appropriations for maintenance and construction, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have decided, and wisely so I think, that the Air Force should be increased another 48 wings, as many wings as we had in 1950 to start with, or to a total of 143 wings. Each of those wings is to be stronger than the wings we had in 1950, have more groups, more personnel, and more fire power. Because of that the Air Force has reprogrammed, reviewed, and reconsidered its entire program. That has been done. They have located the bases and have decided on the missions for which these bases are to be used, both here at home and abroad; they have the master plan for these bases; they know in reason now just about what is necessary.

I am not going to tell you that mistakes have not been made and that waste has not occurred in a program as tremendous as this. The committee in its 4 or 5 months of study is happy to tell you that it has found no evidence of graft, no evidence of misconduct, and I submit to you that human nature, being what it is, has not yet reached the stage where it makes no mistakes where any progressive effort is made. I think we must review this request for appropriations in line with that philosophy.

Notwithstanding the fact that we have reduced or transferred some \$803,987, we believe that we have a sound appropriation, adequate to carry out the proposed programs until next June.

The subcommittee in its study of the construction program in conjunction with the armed services—and it was a joint study—believes that it has been instrumental in saving many millions of dollars to the American taxpayers. Procedures have been expedited, standardization has been more nearly approached. The committee is insisting that those buildings which are in common use on bases must be built from standard plans. In making this appropriation the committee has insisted that complete increments shall be built, that no such thing as half a barrack, half a runway, or half a dock in the case of the Navy, shall be built, but that any increment started shall be completed, and that sufficient funds for its completion shall be apportioned.

In order to have a better check over the money expended by the Armed Forces the committee has requested that each 30 days each of the services submit to the committee an account of the money which has been spent, the base on which it is spent, and the increment for which it is being obligated or spent.

The committee has decreed that there shall be no cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts over \$25,000 unless justified in writing by the Secretary of Defense. Unless the situation worsens I do not believe there will be any attempt to make cost-plus-

fixed-fee contracts under the 1953 appropriations.

The committee has worked diligently, cooperatively, and long hours to bring you a sound recommendation. I know of no man who has worked more intelligently and willingly and patriotically than the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], and the very fine staff assigned to us headed by Mr. Donnelly.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has discussed with you the new approach which we recommend in regard to the Air Force brought about by reprogramming on account of the expansion of the Air Force in the last few months. This approach was brought about largely by the suggestions of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin. I think it is a logical approach and that it surrounds with the safety which Congress demands, the appropriations which the Congress makes. The appropriation is recommended on the basis of categories, so much for runway and apron paving, maintenance and shop facilities, and so forth. There will be no transfers between categories. We did give them the opportunity of transferring 10 percent between commands but within the same category. The names of all the bases on which this money is to be spent in the United States are listed in this report, the committee has been given the location of the bases abroad on which they propose to spend the money, but, of course, those bases are in confidence and cannot be published.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Army let me give you some of the principal items which are listed by categories: Research and development, sixty-five and two-tenths million; warehousing and storage, eleven and nine-tenths; maintenance and shops for these new heavy implements of war which are coming off the assembly lines thirty-one and one-tenth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. RILEY. Continuing, permanent barracks, thirty-eight and one-tenth million; antiaircraft, twenty-five million; land acquisition, eighteen and one-tenth million. This land is largely at Fort Bragg, N. C.; Fort Hood, Tex.; Fort Knox, Ky.; to take care of the longer range artillery which is coming off the lines. We simply must have more land on which to practice with these modern guns.

Expansion of base utilities, sixteen and four-tenths; training facilities, fifteen and four-tenths. A total of \$260,000,000 requested at home and \$393,000,000 requested abroad for the Army.

For the Navy, shipyard facilities, twenty-six and eight-tenths million; fleet facilities, thirty-three and eight-tenths; aviation facilities, one hundred and fifty and two-tenths; supply facilities, thirty-four and eight-tenths; Marine Corps facilities, twenty-four and two-tenths; ordnance facilities, fifty-

four and eight-tenths; yards and docks, twenty-three and one-tenth. Zone of the interior, two hundred and sixty-seven million requested; abroad, one hundred and thirty-seven million requested; largely, you see, for storage of fuel, ammunition, and things of that kind, also proper utilities to take care of the great fleet.

In the Air Force will you note that pavements are \$373,000,000. I want to say here that the operation of facilities for all these services must be constructed first and the auxiliary structures secondly. Operational facilities, fuel lines, and so forth, two hundred and six million; housing for troops—no family housing at home but some abroad—one hundred and eighty-one million; maintenance and storage shops, two hundred and eleven and five-tenths million. Zone of the interior, five hundred and sixty million requested; overseas, six hundred and ninety million requested.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, we have brought you a sound justification for the requests of the armed services. We believe we have given them all the money they can properly spend between now and next June. We believe that we are providing for the defense of the United States in its ever expanding defense program and we hope that you will consider favorably the recommendations made by the committee.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this would cover all of the money that could be spent between now and next June?

Mr. RILEY. I feel that way, yes.

Mr. BROOKS. That is not the information that I have obtained. As I understand it, in your hearings is a statement that this money will just last until the 1st of March rather than June.

Mr. RILEY. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the lowest estimate we have is that it will last until the 1st of April. I believe the majority of the committee are of the opinion that it will last until June. I do not believe that this money can be properly obligated before June.

Mr. BROOKS. There is a \$550,000,000 cut in the Air Force?

Mr. RILEY. Either a cut or deferment.

Mr. BROOKS. That reduction, as I understood, was put in there with the idea that beginning in the early part of January we could get another appropriation to continue the work in the Air Force, otherwise it will be interrupted.

The gentleman does not share that view though, does he?

Mr. RILEY. The Air Force has unobligated as of June 30, 1952, in round numbers, \$1,500,000,000. This committee is recommending \$1,200,000,000 which would give \$2,700,000,000 to be obligated between now and next June. If the Air Force takes that and does a good job, I will be one of the happiest people in this country.

Mr. BROOKS. I agree with the gentleman in reference to round numbers, but all of it is not for public works. Some of it is for overseas and designated by the Congress, wisely, for certain purposes. But, for your general air program, you really are leaving the matter in shape where we will have to put through a bill early next year, otherwise the air program will be interrupted; is that not true?

Mr. RILEY. I do not think so. If the Air Force finds it is running out of money between now and next April 1 or June 1, this committee will be glad to hear any application that they may make for additional funds.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I want to ask the gentleman whether he has read the last report of the Johnson committee of the other body, dealing with the Air Force. According to that report we are confronted with a very serious situation, concerning the preparedness of our country.

Mr. RILEY. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that this committee has been making a study of the construction program since early last February. We have had our own hearings, our own testimony, our own investigators in regard to the operations of all the services, including the Air Force.

Mrs. BOLTON. Have you compared the findings with those of the other committee?

Mr. RILEY. We have also read some of the testimony of the Johnson committee, but we believe that our testimony is fully as adequate as theirs.

Mrs. BOLTON. And your testimony is available, is it?

Mr. RILEY. Yes. Most of the hearings have been published, and are available if the gentlewoman cares to read them.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be confined to the emergency agencies which comprise chapter 10 of the bill. The portion of the bill to which I will refer begins on page 37 and extends through page 42, and in the committee report it begins on page 60 and runs through page 66.

The emergency agencies subcommittee took the following action which I think the Committee of the Whole should understand. I would first like to refer to the action which was taken in reference to the Defense Production Administration. We made a cut of 21 percent in the budget request for this particular agency. For the Defense Transport Administration the subcommittee has recommended a cut of 12 percent.

For the Small Defense Plants Administration we have made a rather minor reduction totaling 16 percent.

For the Federal Security Agency the reduction totals 26 percent.

For the Department of Agriculture the reduction is 33 1/3 percent.

For the Department of Commerce the reduction is 28 percent. Dollarwise it is \$10,000,000.

For the Department of the Interior the reduction is 37 percent below the budget request, a dollar reduction of \$1,500,000.

The Department of Justice has received a reduction percentagewise of 59 percent, a reduction dollarwise totaling \$125,000.

The Department of Labor has a percentage reduction of 16 percent. Dollarwise that amounts to \$350,000.

Out of the funds requested totaling \$61,610,000 our subcommittee has recommended funds totaling \$44,190,000 a total dollar reduction of \$17,420,000 a percentagewise reduction of 28 percent.

You will find that in the bill there are certain omissions, omissions which I think are legitimate, at this point, anyhow. The committee did not take any action on the budget request for the Economic Stabilization Agency and all of its component parts. The Economic Stabilization Agency requested \$103,250,000 for the next fiscal year. That is an increase of about \$2,500,000 over the current fiscal year. In other words, the Economic Stabilization Agency, despite their own admission that their job is not quite as all-encompassing as it has been, wants the Congress to increase the funds for the coming fiscal year. This point of view is a little ridiculous, in my judgment.

The committee has not made any recommendation concerning this agency because at the time we marked up the bill the Defense Production Act had not as yet been approved in the House of Representatives. It is my understanding that the House will not include any amount for this agency in this bill. When the appropriation bill goes to the Senate they can put in what they see fit and we can adjust it in conference.

Let me give you a situation, however, which points out the ridiculousness of some of the budget requests, that come before the Committee on Appropriations. Last year for the Economic Stabilization Agency the budget requested \$143,430,000. Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Eric Johnston, and Mike DiSalle all came up and pleaded with the committee for \$143,430,000. The Congress finally approved for those agencies that are part of the Economic Stabilization Agency \$100,553,375. In other words, we cut that appropriation almost \$43,000,000. Yet in the testimony that was taken by our committee this year on their budget request for the next fiscal year practically every agency admitted they had enough money to do the job that was assigned to them. It just points out the complete ridiculousness of the Bureau of the Budget request for this kind of agency.

I should like to turn for just a minute to the budget request that was submitted for the Office of Price Stabilization. As I indicated, we are not including any funds in this bill for this agency. Never-

theless, I think you should know what the Bureau of the Budget requested.

The Bureau of the Budget has suggested that Congress approve for OPS for the next fiscal year \$68,420,000. They want 12,741 permanent positions for OPS. That is slightly less dollarwise than the Congress approved for OPS last year. The budget this year for OPS totaled \$69,430,000 for 13,131 permanent positions.

I am sure everyone thinks OPS has had too much money and too many jobs, but let me show you some factual evidence which will substantiate that statement and that belief.

The House Committee on Appropriations in January and February of this year undertook investigations of the operations of four district offices of the OPS—one in Grand Rapids, Mich., one in Atlanta, Ga., one in Birmingham, Ala., and one at Omaha, Nebr. Following local complaints I requested the investigation of the Grand Rapids office, which is in my district. Here is a copy of the investigation. It is most revealing. It shows without question of doubt that there is substantial overstaffing and there is extreme duplication. In addition the various investigations point out that we ought to cut out all regional offices for the OPS. There is no need for any continuation of the 14 regional offices throughout the United States for OPS. I cannot tell you how much money they involve, but the reports made by our investigators, the investigators for the Committee on Appropriations, indicate clearly that there is little need for any of the regional offices. These four investigations further show that there could be at least a 50-percent reduction in the appropriations for OPS generally. Conditions in OPS have been very bad for the past year with a budget of \$69,430,000. One wonders how much worse it would have been if the Congress had approved the budget request of \$105,500,000.

I respectfully request that you turn to the emergency agency hearings. I think they start at page 439 of that particular volume. During the hearings the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and I interrogated Mr. Putman and Mr. Arnall throughout these hearings you will see without any doubt whatsoever that that agency, the Economic Stabilization Agency and its component parts is greatly overstaffed. It has received for the past fiscal year altogether too much money, and it is my hope in conference, we will be able to reduce substantially the funds for the coming fiscal year for all agencies that come under Mr. Putnam's jurisdiction.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I do not know if you found in your investigations that they have a great number of people employed, sort of public relations people, to go out and sell the idea of the beauty and benefits of this OPS. I know that is being abused in my own State of Illinois. I know that from my own personal knowledge.

Mr. FORD. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois, there is no doubt that the numerous information officers have not been doing the job that they should have been doing, instead they have been going out throughout the length and breadth of the land trying to sell the need and necessity for the continuation of OPS.

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the building up of the Armed Forces of this Nation to the point where we can adequately defend ourselves in the Communist world of today, and to protect this Nation for future generations, I want to call to the attention of the committee a few facts which I have prepared, which have appeared in the public press and on the radio concerning the conduct of this Nation in carrying on the Korean meat-grinding operation. Along with other Americans, I am continually amazed, shocked, infuriated, disgusted, and now am contemptuous of the criticism levelled at this Nation by members of the so-called United Nations for the manner in which we are conducting the meat-grinding operations in Korea. At this time the Department of Defense admits officially—and I speak on my own responsibility because I have not cleared this with the Department of Defense and do not propose to—they admit at least 100,000 of the flower of American youth have been wounded or killed or are missing in this questionable conflict. At this time \$400,000,000 are being spent monthly, and over \$7,000,000,000 have been spent on the Korean war.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Does the gentleman from South Carolina appreciate the fact that the casualties he refers to are only the battle casualties in Korea, and the casualties off of the front are more than that?

Mr. RIVERS. I am not at all surprised.

America has furnished over 93 percent of all the air power in Korea, over 85 percent of all the naval support in Korea. It has financed—that is a very sensitive term; that is the most sensitive nerve in your body—has financed over 90 percent of all the United Nations in Korea; has over 50 percent of all the ground troops in Korea; and to make things even more alarming, of the 17 United Nations in Korea or represented on the peninsula, 15 of the nations contribute only 10 percent or less of the ground troops on that peninsula. The South Koreans who live there did not

have any place else to go. They are fighting for their homes. I do not blame them, and they did a pretty good job. We financed them. There was nobody else to finance them. They contributed roughly 41 percent of all the troops in Korea. Those two countries, South Korea and the United States, contributed over 91 percent of all the ground troops in that part of the world. The rest of them, and I will name them, Britain, Luxemburg, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, have provided 1.56 percent of the ground troops.

Incidentally, the other day the Prime Minister of Canada did not like the fact that some Canadians were sent to Kojima to try to preserve order. He complained to Truman. I do not know why he did not complain to the United Nations.

Then we get down to Great Britain. They contributed 3.69 percent—less than 3¾ percent of the ground troops in Korea.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is talking my language.

Mr. RIVERS. Any old port in a storm.

Mr. GROSS. I am not going to knock him off the track when he talks that way. I saw figures the other day showing that out of 1,400 planes lost the United Nations lost 16.

Mr. RIVERS. I appreciate that contribution.

We read in the press and hear over the radio that certain people in Great Britain are dissatisfied with our bombing of the power plants in the area of the Yalu. We hear it stated that Acheson has even made an apology or is on the brink of jumping in to make an apology for our actions in Korea, for the actions of Mark Clark who is implementing the recommendations of MacArthur made well over a year ago. As one American, speaking for countless thousands of other Americans, and particularly for RIVERS, I want to state right here and now that we neither owe Great Britain nor any segment of Great Britain nor anybody else in the United Nations any apologies for our actions of recent days. Had we bombed this area when MacArthur recommended it—I am defending MacArthur as an American too; not as a Republican, not as a Democrat. I am defending him as an American and on my own responsibility again. The fact remains; and nobody can deny it, that had his advice been heeded parts of Manchuria today would have smoldering ruins, and those hydroelectric power plants would have been as dry as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

The bombing of the power plants at the Manchurian border, as I said, comes a long time too late. This part of the landscape generally would have looked like a desert.

Had MacArthur's request been heeded the Chinese would not have been given

the golden time to replace obsolete or obsolescent aircraft with MIG jets using British motors. Had MacArthur's advice been heeded a great percentage of those people would still be radiating in the broad light of atomic energy.

We have read the disgusting account in the papers of yesterday on the left-wing Attlee-crats and Bevin-ites—you can take either one of them; I do not want any part of them—gloating over allegedly participating in MacArthur's dismissal. I am glad to see that the President of the United States has repudiated that statement, and I hope it is true.

We view the hideous specter on the floor of Commons in Great Britain of these Communist sympathizers using America as the international whipping boy before the world and criticizing the good faith of this Nation in our conduct of the war nobody in America wanted. But we are there and we are going to stay there until we win, I hope—or get out and forget it, but do something.

America has not forgotten that it was the British Empire who gave the Russians jet motors. We have not forgotten that they run oil on the coast of China, and we have not forgotten that Hong Kong prospers today through Red China dealing with the outside world and that city reaping the benefits of that traffic.

Speaking on my own responsibility again, and speaking as one who has labored tirelessly in the Committee on the Armed Services trying to build up our Armed Forces for whatever may come in the future, I call upon these people to cease their criticism of this Nation, to participate in the Korean struggle in good faith, to terminate running with the foxes and the hounds in Korea and in Red China; and as condition precedent to requiring any information on the strategy employed by MacArthur's successor, Mark Clark, to acknowledge the eternal debt she owes this Nation for her very existence and to acknowledge officially to the world that if they desert us we will not stand alone; they will not stand at all.

I am not criticizing the distinguished Britons who, like us, admire Churchill and who admire Eden, and I am not criticizing those Britons who despise socialism and communism as we do; I am criticizing that crew, whomsoever the hat fits, who want to keep this country in the twilight area of socialism and communism and who do not want to return to the democratic way of life. I am getting "darned" tired of my Nation's being held up to ridicule and scorn when we are paying the bill for their right to use the sounding board of the United Nations to our detriment and of the conduct of the war which we are running and from which they are running.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

(Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. JACKSON of California addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, quite briefly I would like to supplement the statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], who properly calls attention to the situation in Korea. I do not know how others have reacted to the news report we had yesterday but I, as an American citizen, was certainly chagrined. I have been embarrassed and insulted by the action of our own Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, who abjectly apologized, according to a news report, for the action we have taken in bombing Yalu. I want to read into the RECORD a brief news report that appeared in the Washington Star last evening:

APOLOGY BY ACHESON TO BRITISH REPORTED

LONDON.—Informed sources said United States Secretary of State Acheson apologized to about 200 members of the British Parliament today for failure to notify Britain in advance of the American bombing of Yalu River plants in Korea this week.

Imagine this ignominious attitude by the Secretary of State, while our sons are dying in Korea. If anything ought to be clear to us today it is that this idea of collective security is an absolute, futile attempt to avoid war. Collective security is a misnomer. If we, as Americans, do not realize that the situation in Korea is controlled almost entirely by political decisions, then we are not awake to the situation. We know that in the Far East, in Korea and Asia, the national interests of Britain and France are not the same interests that we have, and it does not seem possible that collective security will work where there is a conflict of interest between the big powers. History proves that national interests always prevail as against collective interests of any group. Failure of Britain, France, and the United States to agree on policy in Korea is undermining the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to get into the RECORD, in support of the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] earlier in the day, when he said that so far as our programs in Europe are concerned, that there are too many people from the United States roaming all over Europe trying to do work that is not necessary. I am going to read from a news dispatch from Bonn, Germany, under date of June 19, by Michael L. Hoffman, which appeared in the New York Times on last Friday, June 20. Now, mind you, this is Hoffman speaking, not SMITH:

UNITED STATES IRKING EUROPE BY SWARM OF AIDES—ORGANIZATION FOUND BAD FOR AMERICAN INFLUENCE ON ECONOMIC RECOVERY

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

BONN, GERMANY, June 19.—The United States Government's influence as a promoter of European economic cooperation has suffered a marked decline lately among top-level Western European officials.

With increasing frankness, men in various countries who have been the real driving force in the whole postwar movement for remaking the European economy in a more sensible form are expressing irritation and despair at the manner in which the United States overseas operations are being handled.

There are not many of these men. They are the people seen at nearly every important international meeting, a small but valiant band of architects of the new Europe of which the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the European coal and steel community, and the European Defense Community are the main symbols and, it is hoped, precursors. They are the people on whose continued enthusiastic cooperation the United States must rely completely for translating the policies to which the United States is committed into terms that will make them workable in Europe.

POLICY ADMINISTRATION SCORED

Unlike their political ministers, these civil servants are worried not so much about the possible overturn of American policy as the result of the coming elections as they are about the way in which the present policies are administered.

I am wondering what Mr. Averell Harriman has to say about this so-called administration defect.

I continue:

If their criticism could be summed up in one word it would be "overorganization."

There are so many American officials dealing at so many levels with European governments on so many different aspects of economic policy that very often one branch of the United States Government does not even know what another is doing in a European capital. Rightly or wrongly, Europeans who have to deal with United States agencies believe that a great deal of this activity is solely a result of the efforts on the part of various Americans to justify what are, on the whole, rather pleasant jobs.

"The amount of interference in our domestic economic affairs has increased in almost direct proportion to the decrease in American aid," one high official of an extremely competently run country said recently. The increasing complication of the laws establishing aid programs and the inclusion of numerous minor and in themselves perfectly laudable conditions for aid recipients has just meant that many more jobs and that many more points at which American officials feel bound to "poke their noses into our affairs," this official, among the greatest friends of United States in Europe, added.

The increasing amount of protocol surrounding American officials is also getting Europeans down. "We don't mind having Ambassador so-and-so visit us," one official recently remarked, "but we do mind his bringing his whole court along."

When 15 or 20 United States officials, including men of ambassadorial rank, generals, and ministers, descend on a small European capital they all have to be entertained often by officials who can barely make ends meet on low European salaries. They all have to be "briefed" and they all have to meet the important people in the local administration—all of whom have plenty of work of their own to do.

IMPEDIMENT TO OBJECTIVES

European officials on whom these burdens fall are convinced that overelaboration of American operations in Europe is both hurting American-European relations and impeding the advance toward commonly held objectives. They believe a drastic simplification of American representation in Europe and the elimination of many aspects of the aid programs involving more or less interfer-

ence in domestic affairs of European countries are necessary to get cooperation back on the right track.

While there are good economic considerations behind the slogan of "trade instead of aid" that has become the keynote of Western Europe's approach to the United States, a good deal of the phrase's popularity in circles where these attitudes really count is simply a reflection of the feeling that the apparatus constructed by the United States in Europe on the basis of the aid programs must be got rid of at almost any price.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, if there is anybody in the House who holds no brief for the British Empire, I should be that one. My ancestors escaped from Ireland at the end of British sabers into Virginia over 200 years ago because of the rapacious, evil imperialism of Great Britain. When I stood on this floor and voted for the British loan, my grandfather McCarthy turned over in his grave. There is no doubt about it. But I was in Britain during the war, and I saw the blitz in London and I saw the V-bombs land. They are a brave and courageous people—God save my soul.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin laments the appearance of the Secretary of State of the United States of America speaking before the members of the British Parliament. The gentleman from Wisconsin stated absolutely incorrectly the situation. Mr. Acheson did not apologize to anybody for the bombing of the power plants on the Yalu. Mr. Acheson quite properly apologized to a sister nation of the United Nations for having failed to advise that sister nation of what was obviously an important matter of policy beyond mere tactics of air operations. Of that there is no doubt.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. The only other man in the House who is a better Irishman than I am is the gentleman who asks me to yield. Of course, I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Do you not think we ought to apologize in about the same ratio or on the same basis which the British Empire furnishes their contribution to the Korean war, and that is on a 5-percent basis?

Mr. FLOOD. In direct ratio to that contribution—perhaps the apology should be so worded. But the fact remains that the gentleman from Wisconsin, and my friends on this side of the aisle, are down here one day saying that Mr. Acheson is running the whole show, and then they are down here the next day saying that everybody else is running it but him. But the fact remains that we do not under any circumstances, Mr. Chairman, and we have said so repeatedly, want the Korean operation to be known as a United States action. This is an action of the United Nations. It must be understood to be so, and we want it to be known as such, and for the record in case anybody is laboring under any doubt, especially the gentleman from Wisconsin who knows much better because he has been on the Committee on

Foreign Affairs with me when I served on it several years ago—he knows better than that, this is a United Nations action. Such action beyond tactics or strategy dictated by American participants must be after consultation, and failure to consult involves a question of courtesy and becomes a matter of proper explanation. The United States of America is the leading nation in the world today, whether my friends to the left think so or not. There is only one thing for a leader to do. A leader must lead or quit. He must get out—hand in your uniform. We are leading.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I had better yield to the gentleman who is well versed on foreign affairs.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I just want to inform the gentleman, I think I can put it this way, that the reason the British were not told of the prospective proposed bombing of the hydroelectric plants was because our military men knew that they would veto that proposal and they were utterly fed up waiting to bomb that utility, and they finally did it.

Mr. FLOOD. I think there is a great deal to what the gentleman says. He may be right. If it was done for that reason, then certainly my friend who just made that important contribution has no objection to the Secretary of State, as a great diplomat, going to the British and saying, "I apologize because we did not tell you." You do not object to the apology? It was simply good manners under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. First, let me say I did not presume there was any need to apologize because I do not presume there were any British planes flying. But I wonder if there were any British stockholders who owned some of these plants or were interested in some of these plants.

Mr. FLOOD. I am sure the gentleman can find out. That has nothing to do with the case, *tra la*. The gentleman from Minnesota usually makes much more pointed contributions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding these plants were built by the Japanese. These were their biggest plants before they were lost to Korea.

Mr. FLOOD. These were all built by the Japanese and run by them from 1939 down to the time they were turned over at the end of occupation. Secretary Acheson apologized for nothing, and if I thought for one moment that he was doing so or running to the British with

his hat in his hand I would be the first to blast him. But this business of twisting the tail of the British lion by certain Americans and the barking at Uncle Sam by certain Englishmen must be stopped. It does no one good and can do all a lot of harm. I hold no brief for British lack of cooperation in Korea, but I also know what Britain has been doing in Malaya for 5 years against communism. It was admittedly an administrative mistake in failing to inform the British and all Secretary Acheson did was to say so and rightly so. It was a case of misunderstanding. It is, of course, difficult for the command to keep all allies informed of every action. This incident will lend itself to better liaison.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER].

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 4 minutes on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, there is a very important section of this appropriation that has not been touched upon as yet, and it has not been touched upon in the committee with a scalpel to reach down to make some savings.

The point 4 program that begins to spread American interest and interference and personnel into some 36 countries of the world is more than doubled, it is more than trebled, and I think probably quadrupled in this appropriation. One hundred and ninety million dollars, says Mr. Wood, is on the straight point 4 program, technical cooperation. I just want to reiterate something that I said when we had the State Department appropriation bill before us, at a time when we really did a job of rationalizing it to the extent of about 33 percent. Here is the State Department appropriation virtually as big as the House of Representatives left that regular bill when it was in here for consideration.

I made this observation, that "there is nothing so permanent as a temporary Federal job." Kick that around a little bit, because, as a previous speaker stated, once you activate a thing and give it an appropriation it turns up with more lives than the proverbial cat.

I want to give you one little item. We are presently in the program, sending 1,150 technicians into the field. This program contemplates 2,761. That is just five times as many as you have in both Houses of your United States Congress. The average cost for each of these is \$14,000 plus per annum. That is more than they pay you. No one can measure the new things these people will turn up with.

There is one thing that ought to be exploded, that communism is based on poverty. It is not so. We have got more Communists in the high-level brackets of income—many of them do not know they are Communists. They will plead guilty to being Socialists, but I never could see much difference in a Marxist, except for the length of the

fuse, between a Communist and a Socialist. It seems, too, that we like it when the theory of socialism alone is considered, but when we reach the point where socialism fails to work, which it always does, and we engage in some violence to make it work, then we have got a lot of these people that do not like it at that point. They then call it communism.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes, at the risk of never getting this slow mind of mine back on the idea, I yield to my delightful friend from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I just want to make one observation in support of the gentleman's contention: Some of the highest-salaried people in this country have turned Communist. I call the gentleman's attention to Paul Robeson as one.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Hollywood is full of examples, and I might say to the gentleman that the sons and grandsons of some of our very rich men have a way of falling off after this Marxist proposition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The best informed man on communism who testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities said he had never seen a Communist who was not well-fed, well-clothed, and well-financed; the idea that it is poverty that promotes communism is bunk.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I will admit that nearly every normal boy, especially if he falls in love at about 19 with a very clever young lady and he thinks that all his life is centered in winning the affections of this young lady—it is a very appealing doctrine if he can have a nice home, and a car, and the young lady. That part is what makes socialism appealing; and it is a perfectly understandable thing in the adolescent period of nearly every youth of either sex. So many of these people have been born to wealth and so few of them have had the hammering from the other side of the tracks to put a cutting edge on them so they can live in a competitive free economy. They failed to grow up. As they get along in years they get a job in the Government, and sometimes some of them get into the State Department. Many of them are these bleeding hearts, these professional do-gooders, these people who have found a new way of life, a new avocation.

Let me tell you the way it works out in the matter of the taxes paid by the people in my county, an agricultural county in Ohio. This budget submitted to us costs each person in this county \$605 a year, \$2,420 per family; and I have one county where it is \$720 per capita, Wood County, Ohio. This thing gets into the realm of the fantastic, and I say to you seriously we should take this point 4 and cut it back at least to last year and pull in our horns a little bit.

You know they do not have hypertension, high blood pressure—well, they are the same thing, I guess—they do not die of coronary thrombosis in any of

these primitive lands, yet we are helping them forward those projects, racing all over the world, stirring up these people who have no tradition of self-government at all; and we are not making Asia happy, and we are not making Indonesia happy by action upsetting the present governments that do more for them than our efforts can.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Briefly.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me what is meant by the use of this perfumed phrase "multilateral technical aid"—multilateral?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes. Multilateral; that means many-sided, a united effort. Korea gives a pretty good example of it. But let me tell you that in the case of all these things with fancy names we pick up over 60 percent of the check. This House has already taken legislative action stating that we will not contribute more than 33 1/3 percent; nevertheless, here is another program where we are supposed to contribute 60 percent-plus of the money.

I am one of a big family of 14 children; eight of us are still living and rustling around for a living and we have got along all right, we have enjoyed life all right, but we have not enjoyed some of the things that have been done to this country that means so much to us. I say we should stop making so many commitments that we bleed our own people to the point of weakness, bankruptcy, and despair.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is not this the first time in an appropriation bill that we have seen this title "multilateral"?

Mr. CLEVENGER. No; these fancy words have become more or less commonplace. What we all need to do is to get a little pocket dictionary that has a list of all this alphabet soup set-up and governmental gobbledygook, and use it when we hear them speak of GARIOA and FIA and the rest of the jargon that goes with this planned economy for the whole world. I am serious about this. We are rapidly reaching the point where you cannot increase taxation in the United States. If any man who has intelligence will look at the reports of corporations he will see that the earnings are falling off, that the high ones after the Korean police action are earning less, which means a bigger deficit from a public that either does not want to buy bonds that depreciate very rapidly or are unable to pay any more taxes.

I think we should take a serious look at this and cut it back to size. We should not increase the program above the 1952 figure.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, when sponsors outfitted ships to explore the United States a good argument was made to promote the spirit of adventure and of wealth. Mutual-security aid is an adventurous program.

If successful, it will mean more security and wealth for the United States and for the people of the world.

Current complaints rippling the 7-year harmony of United Nations' allies is a healthy sign. The giant stirs.

Some criticize the United States for its seemingly unilateral idea to destroy the Yalu power projects. Others are concerned with U. N.'s prestige. Can we attribute all this to Gromyko? Was not his move to the London post supposed to cleave the British from NATO? The solid citizens of England, Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, Canada, and the United States will not be taken in.

I look at overseas complaints at this time against the mutual-security efforts of the United States as an indication of success.

For over 125 years shop foremen of European countries, and of Asiatic for that matter, have been on the ground doing a job in their own way. A newcomer, the United States, has arrived. Others think they can do the job better because they have been at it longer. Question of adjustment, is it not? Pure, simple human relations. America is a Nation of coaches—turns out good teams, stays on the side lines, delights in the excellence of others, especially up-and-comers.

The fact that 100,000 people at Koje threw off Communist allegiance under the most adverse circumstances convinces me that the hearts of the people of the world are still with us. Our fight for mutual security and the liberty of man is a good one. Of course, there are those who jockey for positions in government and on jobs in aid areas who might be self-centered and confused. Too much enlightenment growing in the free areas?

America has grown because it has had faith in the people. I think we should keep this faith abroad.

We have a job to do. We must convince the people of Europe that their efforts can help keep Great Britain, France, and Germany in peace, and the same for the people of Asia. Japan and a free China can live in peace.

Our presence on the world scene has caused some consternation, perhaps. We call our shots as we see them. We dislike double-dealing, tricky moves, playing one off against the other. Our simplicity will win; it is of the people, direct.

I am sure the people of Europe and of Asia realize the reason for our enthusiasm in mutual security. We have been smacked in the jaw by war twice now, in my life; twice in the Atlantic and twice in the Pacific. In the Atlantic, in World War I, and World War II. In the Pacific, at Pearl Harbor and in Korea.

We have qualified for membership in the fight to promote mutual security.

Our hands are extended in friendship to the people of the Atlantic and the Pacific. We are not encased in a shell, like a turtle in the middle of the road, ripe target for squashing by a juggernaut.

Our guard is extended to Europe and to Asia in the factories, fields, and in the homes. The hearts of the people are with us. They are secure in the feeling that, by mutual aid to promote knowledge and health we promote the spirit of adventure and of wealth, like sponsors of ships of old, to explore the United States.

Genuine mutual security aid is an adventurous program. If successful, it means more security and wealth for the United States and for the people of the world.

I ask to list in the RECORD at this point, Mr. Chairman, by unanimous consent several items dealing with:

(a) The Yalu River hydroelectric power project.

(b) The Yalu River power project: The case for and against its destruction, as of December 21, 1950.

(c) British foreign policy in Europe and Asia, 1850-1950. This is a brief outline of British interest in both areas, and points up how England has sought friends in Europe to keep from being overcome on her channel flank (the American flank is secure) and how her policy in Asia has shifted from support of China in 1895 to Japan in 1902, then back to China. I shall develop this later. A and B below were developed by the Library of Congress:

THE YALU RIVER POWER PROJECT: THE CASE FOR AND AGAINST ITS DESTRUCTION, AS OF DECEMBER 1950

(Prepared for the use of Members of Congress)

BACKGROUND

The installed capacity of the hydroelectric power plants in North Korea has been estimated at about 1,500,000 kilowatts. These plants were established during the period of Japan's occupancy of the country, and were designed to serve not only North and South Korea but also parts of South Manchuria.

It is the hydroelectric project along the Yalu River, sometimes spoken of as the TVA of Asia, which has been mentioned in the press as a possible target for destruction. The installations which make up this project are located partly in Manchuria and partly in North Korea.

When the military conflict in the Far East concerned only the North Korean aggressors and the United Nations forces, little public consideration was given to the Yalu project. In the fall of 1950, however, with the appearance of Chinese volunteers in the opposing lines, there was some speculation that their purpose was to protect this hydroelectric system. But as far as can be determined, Peking has never indicated publicly that such a consideration was a specific reason for its intervention in Korea. Furthermore, President Truman, on November 16, 1950, made clear that we would support a United Nations policy which was designed "to hold the Chinese frontier with Korea inviolate, to protect fully legitimate Korean and Chinese interests in the frontier zone, and to withdraw the United Nations forces from Korea as soon as stability has been restored and a unified, independent, and democratic government is established throughout Korea." By implication this statement would appear to include the protection of the Chinese interests in the Yalu project.

Once it became apparent that not merely volunteers but regular Chinese Communist army units in mass strength were involved in North Korea, the question of the destruction of the Yalu project received considerable public attention. As of this

date no action has been taken against these installations.

In considering the pro and con aspects of this question, it is difficult to confine the discussion solely to the Yalu project. The problem is not merely one of whether we shall or shall not destroy the hydroelectric system. In the last analysis it involves the larger question of whether or not the area of combat is to be extended to include Manchuria and other parts of China.

MILITARY ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION

Arguments in favor of the destruction of the Yalu project are concerned largely with the handicap which strict regard for the Chinese-Korean border places on the United Nations military command. General MacArthur, for example, has expressed his consternation over the "privileged sanctuary" which Manchuria affords the Communist forces. He has not requested publicly, however, specific permission to destroy the Yalu project.

It has also been pointed out that failure to destroy the installations tends to create a serious morale problem among the forces who are called upon to do the fighting. Maj. ALFRED SIEMINSKI, a Congressman from New Jersey, reported on his return from Korea that the soldiers there "are saying that a cartel has a stake" in the power project. While the specific charge may have no validity, the fact remains that some men in the field are disturbed by the failure to take action against what appears to them to be a legitimate target. Moreover, as the major has pointed out, to argue that it is not a military target is difficult to reconcile with our bombing of the nitrate plant in Hungnam (North Korea).¹

Still another argument in favor of destruction is that such action would shut off power to the Mukden (Manchuria) arsenal. In prewar years this arsenal was an important source of military equipment for the Japanese Kwantung army. While Mukden undoubtedly suffered serious damage during the Russian occupation of 1945-46 and the drawn-out struggle for Manchuria (1946-48), the arsenal probably still retains some productive capacity. There is no reason, this argument contends, why we should not attempt to cut off this supply if it is possible to do so by destroying its source of power.

Those who argue against bombing the Yalu project point out that it would have little, if any, effect on the fighting capacity of the Chinese armies in Korea. The Chinese Communists, it is pointed out, use largely light weapons which are either manufactured in small arsenals scattered throughout China, supplied by the Russians, or captured from opposing forces. If destruction would not interfere appreciably with the supply of the Communists, what other military advantage, it is asked, would be obtained?

Still another argument in opposition to bombing the project is derived from the fact that the United Nations has not sanctioned the carrying of the war beyond the Korean border. If we were to move on our own initiative, therefore, we could not be certain of allied support. Destruction of the plants, moreover, according to this argument, would almost certainly be the beginning of conflict with Communist China of unforeseeable consequences. What advantage, it is asked, would be derived from such a struggle? Do we have the resources to spare for even "limited war" with China when there are so many other danger spots in the world struggle with communism perhaps of greater significance to the free nations?

¹ Washington Star, December 21, 1950, p. A-28.

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION

Political arguments in favor of action against the Yalu project and other targets in Manchuria stress the fact that the United States tried without success to forestall Communist intervention by pledging itself to safeguard China's border interests. What more is there to be gained by further efforts to conciliate or to appease the Chinese Communists? Why talk about avoiding war with China when the Communists have already precipitated war?

If we destroy the Yalu project, it is contended, it will spell out in the only language which the Peiping leaders understand that they cannot expect to launch aggressive actions without suffering the consequences in the form of retaliation. The lesson will not be lost on the Chinese people. It will be clear to them that they must get rid of the Communist rulers who have plunged them into this dangerous situation.

It is, furthermore, the duty of the United Nations, which is responsible in the first instance for the police action in Korea, to accept the logic of the Chinese intervention and now declare Peiping the aggressor. Such a step will clear away any doubts about the legal or political validity of the bombing of the Yalu project. If the United Nations delays any longer in this vital matter, it will lose the respect of the world's peoples and especially of the United States which has made by far the greatest sacrifices on its behalf.

On the other side of the question, a principal reason for opposing the destruction of the Yalu project is to be found in the fact that the United Nations has not yet sanctioned extension of the area of conflict beyond Korea. Supporters of this view contend that we should, at all costs, avoid a unilateral step if only because such action, if it became necessary, should have the widest possible support since it may involve a protracted and formal struggle with Communist China. Opponents also point out that Peking has charged that our invasion of Korea is but a preliminary to an attack on China proper. If, therefore, we destroy the project and are then led by military necessity to extend our operations to Chinese cities and ports, Peking's propaganda claims will obtain considerable validity in the eyes of the Chinese people. This fact, plus our action in regard to Formosa and the deep-rooted antiforeignism of the Chinese will tend to draw the Chinese people closer to the government in Peking than they now are. If there is any possibility of splits within China, therefore, they are less likely to appear under these circumstances to plague the Communist regime.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION

Those who support destruction insist that the rehabilitation and reconstruction of China depends very heavily upon full utilization of the industrial establishment in Manchuria. The main source of power for this establishment will disappear if the Yalu project is crippled. Deprived, thus, of the productive potential of Manchuria, the Chinese Communists will face a serious economic crisis. China will become a nation on relief and if the Soviet Union fails to supply it with this relief, serious internal difficulties may be expected. Either way the free world stands to benefit.

In opposition to this point of view, it is pointed out that China managed to survive the long war with Japan without the use of the Manchurian facilities, much of the time without any considerable external aid. The Chinese are primarily an agricultural people and the Communists draw their strength heavily from the rural areas. Crippling the Yalu power system, even assuming that alternative sources could not be improvised, the argument runs, is not likely to

have much effect on the survival power of the Peking regime. Destruction of the Yalu project, moreover, will make the ultimate job of rehabilitating Korea extremely difficult. While it is all very well to speak of the principle involved, the fact remains that the Korean people have suffered most deeply and most directly as a result of the conflict. If the United Nations is to fulfill its responsibilities in Korea, power from the Yalu will be urgently needed when the military campaigns are over.

THE YALU RIVER HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECT

ORIGIN

After the Japanese obtained full control of Manchuria in 1932, they moved swiftly to increase the power facilities of the region in line with their plans for rapid industrialization. Among the projects which were envisioned was the construction of a system of hydroelectric installations along the Yalu River which forms part of the border between Manchuria and Korea. During the 1940's, the Yalu project and its associated distribution network became a principal source of electricity for Manchuria and Korea.

CONSTRUCTION

Work began in August 1937 on the installation at Sup'ong (Suiho) on the Korean side of the river. The Sup'ong site is located about 75 miles north of the mouth of the Yalu River (at latitude 40°27' and longitude 124°57'). In 1941, the installation was brought into partial operation with a reported capacity of 445,000 kilowatts with an average volume of water and 640,000 kilowatts with a maximum flow.¹

The turbines installed in the plant were made by the Dengyosha Prime Mover Works and the generators by the Shibaura Engineering Works. Both were Japanese firms located in Tokyo.

Two other sites along the river were laid out as parts of the Yalu project and some work was done on them. The degree to which they were completed and equipped, however, is not determinable from available sources. An additional four sites along the river were scheduled for development but no evidence has been found to indicate that construction of installations was actually begun.

OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Because of the complexities of the economic and financial structure of Imperial Japan, it is extremely difficult to trace precisely which interests owned and managed the Yalu project. At the time the Sup'ong construction was initiated, the Japanese were engaged in an immense expansion and rationalization of the industry of Manchuria and Korea. The financing of this expansion was, for the most part, an intricate blending of effort by governmental bodies and the so-called Zaibatsu, the great oligarchic business houses of Japan.

Available information indicates that the construction and management of the Sup'ong power station was a joint undertaking of the Oryokko (Yalu) Hydroelectric Co. of Korea and the Oryokko (Yalu) Hydroelectric Co. of Manchukuo. Both companies, apparently, were established in 1937 especially for the Yalu development project, the former under the laws of Japan and the latter under the laws of Manchukuo.

The companies each had a capitalization of yen 50,000,000.² Initially, at any rate, the

Government of Manchukuo owned the entire 500,000 shares of the Yalu Hydroelectric Co. of Manchukuo while the 500,000 shares of the Yalu Hydroelectric Co. of Korea appear to have been divided as follows:

	Shares
The Oriental Development Co. (Toyo Takushoku) -----	200,000
Chosen Sup'ong (Changjin River Hydroelectric Co.) -----	200,000
Chosen Electrical Transmission Co. -----	100,000

By 1942, it seems that the Japan Nitrogen Co. (Nippon Chisso Hiryo) had become the exclusive owner of the Yalu Hydroelectric Co. of Korea. The stock of Japan Nitrogen Co., one of Japan's great business firms, was held by numerous owners. Among the largest were banks, trust companies, and life insurance companies in Japan which, in turn, were largely subsidiaries of various Zaibatsu.

The Japan Nitrogen Co. was in exclusive control of the actual construction of the Sup'ong installation. Previously, it had developed hydroelectric power sites in various other parts of North Korea.

Since the end of the war, the Yalu project has been under the control of Communist authorities in Manchuria and North Korea.

Sources: Manshukoku Gensei (current conditions in Manchuria), 1943, Edwin Pauley. Report on Japanese Assets in Manchuria, 1946. The Manchukuo Year Book, 1942. Report of the Mission on Japanese Combines, 1946. Andrew J. Grajdanzev, Modern Korea, New York, 1944.

NEW CONGRESSMAN SPEAKS—GI'S REPORTED TO BELIEVE DAMS PRESERVED BECAUSE OF CARTEL

(By Russell Brines)

TOKYO, December 21.—Military circles here appeared baffled today by comments on the Korean campaign by Maj. ALFRED SIEMINSKI, New Jersey's new Congressman-elect. He dwelt particularly on the fact that Allied planes had not bombed out the Communists' Yalu River power dams on the Korean-Manchurian border and inside North Korea.

The Jersey City Democrat, who was elected to Congress while fighting in Korea, arrived in New York yesterday.

SIEMINSKI told New York reporters that soldiers at the front "are saying that a cartel has a stake" in the Yalu power dams and the Changjin Reservoir district in northeast Korea. A cartel in this sense usually is an international combine or pool of business interests operating an economic development.

A military spokesman said if there is such a cartel in Soviet satellite, North Korea, "I would like to know how the cartel converted its rubles into good American dollars." The Japanese-built power project along the Yalu has been under tight Russian control since 1945.

SIEMINSKI was quoted in New York as saying:

"It seems that the United Nations places more value on cement and concrete than on the blood of those who gave their lives for the cause. They—the GI's—want to know who has a stake in the power dams and the power installations in the reservoir district where the Tenth Corps and marines fought their way out.

"The Japanese, the Chinese, the North Koreans, and the Soviet Union have not destroyed them, and we have not destroyed them. They—the GI's—are saying that a cartel has a stake in those projects. * * *

"If we are out to defeat Communist China, we can do it by taking their source of power today. If we blow up the installations, Communist China cannot exist, and you will have Soviet Russia with a nation on relief."

The military spokesman here contended the power projects were saved from destruction because they were not sufficiently important in the total military situation. He added that the projects provided "a very

little amount of electricity for Communist China and a little bit for North Korea."

I thought the interpretations of the military in Tokyo in December 1950, rather interesting in comparison to Pentagon attitudes today.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses of the House

Stationery (revolving fund): For an additional amount for "Stationery (revolving fund)", \$132,200, including an additional stationery allowance of \$300 for each Representative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, to remain available until expended.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 21 and 22 and insert the following:

"For an additional amount for House Office Buildings: \$48,750.

"House Restaurants: For structural and mechanical changes, labor, materials, equipment and all other necessary items to provide for carrying out food service in the New and Old House Office Buildings, to be operated as part of the House of Representatives restaurants, \$23,000."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, this is just a perfecting amendment to make the necessary change in the language of the bill and does not change the amount nor the intent. I have conferred with the ranking Republican Member and I understand he has no objection.

Mr. HORAN. There is no objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

For an additional amount for "House Office Buildings," including structural and mechanical changes, \$71,750.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. (After counting) 145 Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

COAST GUARD

Operating expenses

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses," \$4,500,000.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, with my colleagues on the subcommittee handling the Treasury and Post Office Department funds, I mourn the passing of our subcommittee clerk, Mr. Adelbert Heinmiller.

Bert, as we affectionately knew him on the committee, came to us 2 years ago from his assignment as budget officer for the District of Columbia schools. He was most characterful. He was very able and he loved his work. He felt he was making a real contribu-

¹ Grajdanzev, A. J., Modern Korea, John Day Co., New York, 1944: p. 137. Grajdanzev takes his figures from Seichi Kojima, Sen-Man-Shi Shinko Keizai, pp. 70-77.

² In 1937, the yen was worth about United States \$0.35. In 1941, the capitalization of each company was apparently increased by an additional yen 50,000,000.

tion to the cause of better government through the Appropriation Committee processes and he did so chiefly because of his earnest approach and keen powers of analysis.

Bert was born in Minnesota 44 years ago. He was graduated from Coe College and received an MA from George Washington University. He took further graduate work at American University in public finance and before joining the District school system he helped organize the Strayer School of Accountancy. He was active in church and Masonic activities and belonged to the Board of Trade and the Washington Rotary Club.

My heart goes out to Bert's courageous and lovable wife and his two young daughters who can be proud of the niche Bert carved for himself in Government.

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Administrative expenses

Not to exceed \$15,500,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be available during the current fiscal year for its administrative expenses, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and use of the services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks: *Provided*, That as used herein the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to include all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices: *Provided further*, That the limiting amount heretofore stated for administrative expenses shall be increased by an amount which does not exceed the aggregate cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside the continental United States; the expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with termination of contracts or in the performance of legal services; and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies: *Provided further*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Corporation shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 6, line 13, strike out "\$15,500,000" and insert "\$14,500,000."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation administrative expenses which would reduce the amount they are authorized to spend by \$1,000,000.

The reason for this amendment is the fact that the testimony in the record shows a considerable reduction in the workload of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the reduction in funds made in this bill is not consistent with the reduction in the workload.

I think the officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are to be complimented on coming before the committee and admitting that their work-

load has been considerably reduced. They asked for some reduction but I do not think they asked for enough.

On page 39 of the hearings Mr. McDonald said that his request for a reduction was initiated in recognition of the smaller volume of new loans which he had previously referred to. I call the committee's attention to page 40 of the hearings. On new commitments in 1951, the actual commitments were \$280,000,000. The 1952 estimate is only \$67,000,000, a considerable reduction in the workload.

In view of the reduction that has been made in the workload of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it will be found on page 73 of the hearings that they have only reduced the size of their administrative staff by 53 employees. It must be recognized that the administrative funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are funds of the Corporation itself. Of course, whether this money is the funds of the Corporation itself or comes out of the Treasury, it is still the money of the American taxpayers.

I believe this amendment should be adopted to further reduce the operating expenses of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I am sure they will not be affected by the \$1,000,000 decrease in their appropriation.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman has offered a good amendment, and I shall support it. I think the amendment ought be supported generally by the members of the committee. I compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he has made.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee was thoroughly familiar with the decrease in the workload of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and took it into consideration in arriving at the amount recommended in the bill. The original request of the RFC was \$18,500,000 for administrative expenses. When the new Administrator came in, we postponed our hearings in order to give him an opportunity to familiarize himself with the duties of his office and also with the needs of the department. Subsequently, he came in with a reduced request. He, himself, reduced the request from \$18,500,000 to \$16,850,000. That was considerably less than was authorized for 1952. Our committee, however, did not allow that amount. We felt that the Corporation could get along with less, and therefore, we recommended \$15,500,000. We believe this amount is necessary to properly administer the various activities of the Corporation. I call your attention to the fact that the RFC in addition to its lending activities also has complete charge of the tin program in this country which is an essential program, the synthetic rubber program, and the ABACA fiber program. It is also the agency designated by the

Congress to liquidate the various war agencies. One way, in my judgment, to encourage poor administration is to refuse to appropriate sufficient funds to permit good administration. In this item, we are not appropriating \$1 from the Treasury. What we are doing is merely limiting the amount that the Corporation can spend from its own receipts for administrative expenses. This is the best estimate that our committee could make of the administrative needs of the Corporation, and I trust it will be the pleasure of this body to sustain our recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY), there were—ayes 72, noes 32.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. Bow and Mr. GARY as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 97, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Education of the blind

For an additional amount for "Education of the Blind", \$60,000.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to appropriate the funds necessary to complete full payment of the Federal obligation to schools in districts affected by Federal activities.

I note that the committee has refused the amounts requested on the grounds that the Federal activities result in an increase in local income, and the committee feels that the school districts should therefore be willing to bear a larger share of the amounts required for education of the children brought to such districts.

This kind of reasoning deals with only one part of the problem with which Public Law 874 is concerned. For example, in my district assistance has been extended under Public Law 874 to the school districts at Nashua and Glasgow, in the vicinity of the Fort Peck Dam project, and at Gardiner near Yellowstone Park. These are instances where the acquisition of land by the Federal Government has severely reduced the tax base of the school district, while at the same time the districts have had to assume the heavy burden of educating children of Federal employees living on these tax-exempt lands. The committee's reasoning, that the school districts should be willing to bear additional expense because of increased income, does not apply in these cases. There is no defense boom here. It is simply a burden that these districts have carried for many years at great cost to the taxpayers. I believe that they are entitled to the full amount of Federal assistance determined by Congress in Public Law 874. This is an obligation of the Federal Government which should be discharged.

(Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$60,000.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENTON: Page 8, after line 20, insert: "payment to school districts: For an additional amount fiscal year 1952 for payments to school districts, \$11,570,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. DENTON. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last five to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are a number of Members standing. That would mean 2 minutes apiece; that is not long enough.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I amend my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last five to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that include or exclude the time of the gentleman from Indiana?

The CHAIRMAN. That is exclusive of the time of the gentleman from Indiana who has already been recognized.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes an additional appropriation of \$11,570,000 to be paid for the maintenance of schools in the Federal-impact areas.

During the Eightieth Congress the Committee on Education and Labor of the House held very extensive hearings concerning the condition of schools in the so-called Federal-impact areas. They found the conditions such, when the Government established an installation—either an Army camp, airfield, defense plant, or anything of the kind—and thereby took local property off the taxable list, that, because of the Government installation, there was a great influx of people and the school population doubled, trebled, or rose even more than that in certain cases. To relieve that situation, the House Committee on Education and Labor proposed two bills: H. R. 874, which provided that the Federal Government should make a contribution toward the maintenance and operation of those schools in Federal-impact areas; and H. R. 815, which provided for the construction for the additional school buildings. I have another amendment which applies to the con-

struction of school buildings in these Federal-impact areas.

For maintenance and operation of these schools, this Congress has already appropriated \$40,000,000. That will pay 76 percent of the amount to which these Federal-impact districts are entitled. It will take this sum of \$11,570,000 to pay them the remaining 24 percent to which they are entitled. These schools have been told they were entitled to this money, and they were so entitled under Federal law. They made commitments, they hired their teachers, they had contracted for other expenses. It is very likely that many of these schools will have to close down, for they will not be able to pay the salaries of their teachers.

After all, while the Government does not have to pay taxes on the property it owns, the Government should be a good citizen. It should accept responsibilities, the same as a good taxpayer. When you own property there are certain obligations of ownership you assume, one of them being the obligation to pay the expenses of local government. The Government should do that. The Government should not renege on its obligation.

In this appropriation bill we have a very large sum of money for foreign aid, the building of air bases, and so forth, in foreign countries, money appropriated under the Mutual Security, or foreign-aid program, and I am in favor of that. But this is a very small sum compared to the amount we are spending for foreign aid. This Federal impact in defense areas arises for exactly the same reasons as are causing us to spend money in Europe, Asia, and in other places.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for offering this particular amendment and I want to commend him also for his explanation of it. I believe that the Government has created an obligation which it cannot forego at the present time because, if it does, the very things which the gentleman has been talking about will take place. I am going to support the amendment and the other one which he will offer later.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I expect to support the gentleman's amendment. This amendment does not include an amount for distressed school districts which are not in the immediate area of a Federal military installation; is that correct? That is in the eleven and one-half million.

Mr. DENTON. The \$80,000,000 is for construction of school buildings that will finish up the program, and the \$11,570,000 is for maintenance and operation of the schools.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to commend the gentleman for offering the amendment and for the fine fight he has made on behalf of these impacted schools. I shall support the gentleman's amendment. As I understand it, this \$11,500,000 will bring it up to just 100 percent of the Government's share of the contribution?

Mr. DENTON. That is correct. It will pay what the Government has contracted and agreed to pay.

Mr. ANDREWS. And unless this amendment carries the Government will only contribute 74 percent of the Government's obligation?

Mr. DENTON. Seventy-six percent, and a large number of schools will have to close down because they cannot pay their bills.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I am supporting the gentleman's amendment. When we talk about a 100-percent Federal contribution, remember, we are not talking about 100 percent of the cost of maintaining the schools. The Federal payment is only a portion of the total school expense, and sometimes only a small portion, figured out on a formula that the Congress worked out. This amendment, as I understand, will provide for carrying out the full present obligation under that formula. I have a school district in my district where they may not be able to continue this fall unless this is provided. This amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] because in the section of the country I come from we have more than one example of Federal responsibility; for instance, in my own district in the city of Livonia the schools simply cannot continue to operate adequately and properly unless there is some Federal assistance given to them in the construction field. I have had many telegrams—and this is not a new matter—and I have been receiving them for several years because of the impact and growth of the school district on account of military installations and the defense effort nearby. In the city of Livonia, adjacent to Detroit, the people have exhausted all legal limits in their effort to raise money to provide school buildings in which to house their children and to take care of them. The board of education has done everything within its power to solve the problem. They cannot go any further. They must look to us—and when I say "us" I mean the Federal Government—because the Federal Government has created the condition which they cannot meet. For that reason I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. No one is going to accuse me of a want of economy on the question of Federal expenditures. I have consistently voted for economy, but here is one case where the people simply cannot meet the con-

ditions that the Federal Government has itself created.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] was discussed at length in our hearings. The committee, outside of the gentleman from Indiana, was unanimous in eliminating this amount from the appropriation. The gentleman from Indiana, talked about a contract or obligation of the Government. There is no contract or obligation of the Government to supply this amount of money 100 percent for the salaries and maintenance of this program. There is no such contract anywhere. That is the reason we have an appropriations committee in this House. If we did not have an appropriations committee you could appropriate on legislative bills. The subcommittee on appropriations of which I am a member considered this item and its judgment was that it not be allowed in the supplemental appropriation bill. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana should be voted down. Members of Congress and merchants plead for these projects in their districts, and after they get them they plead for money, because they are in a federally impacted area, and want appropriations out of the Federal Treasury. I say we have to call a halt to this spending sometime, and this is a good time to do it. If you vote for the appropriation contained in this amendment do not go back into your districts and say you voted for economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], simply because I believe the Federal Government should meet its obligations the same as any citizen or any private industry. The Federal Government has come into many of the school districts of the land and taken over a part of the taxable property, and then, after these Government's defense installations has dumped thousands of additional children into the schools of those areas it has failed or refused to pay a fair share of the cost of operating the schools affected. This measure now before us carries billions of dollars to take care of the very same sort of situations in foreign countries for the benefit of foreign peoples. We have reached a sad state of affairs here in America when we cannot educate our own children, or are unwilling, as a Federal Government, to meet the cost of educating the children the Government moves into these school districts, and yet at the same time our Government is ready and willing to freely spend our money to help educate the children of other lands. So I say, as a matter of simple justice this amendment should be adopted. It is not a waste of

money; but it is a real economy to support the public school systems in defense areas, because after all the greatest resource America has is the children of today who will be the leaders of tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will see fit to support the good work in this field that has been done by the Committee on Education and Labor. I am advised that not only this \$11,500,000 has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but also the construction program of \$80,000,000. That is to be considered later. In their hearings and in their work, the Committee on Education and Labor has taken the Army and Navy schools in local areas out of politics. They have provided that the local school boards can run their own affairs. Now there are some districts where thousands of citizens have been moved into arid areas, where there is not a sufficient tax base to hire a janitor. The local people are doing everything that they can. This is a program based on a formula that will allow the Army and the Navy to rely on local schools. They thus avoid raising these funds through a military deficiency appropriation 4 or 5 months after the schools start. I believe the Congress should support the Education and Labor Committee, of which I am a member. I think every member of that committee, including the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], supports this amendment, and the one to provide construction, which I will offer in a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, and to point out that this is the right step in trying to meet the situation that has developed in the Federal impact area, not that it particularly applies to my district entirely, but surrounding it we have many Federal installations, such as the General Hospital, Lowery Field, and other Federal agencies, where we have children who must be educated.

It is true that as one of these laws is drawn it discriminates against my district, that is the city and county of Denver, in that they had too much school population at a certain date in order to become eligible to receive some of these funds. However, I believe that this amendment is absolutely necessary, and that we should support this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I come from an area where we have tremendous military installations. One school there has had its enrollment increased by more than 3,000 military children. They would benefit through this appropriation

to the extent of \$34,000, or about \$11 per student. I think that is a very small amount that this Government owes to that school to educate the children of military personnel.

I do not agree with my friend from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] that we do not have a contract, an obligation. We certainly do have a strong moral obligation to support the schools where these military children are being educated.

I hope this body will give this amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana unanimous support.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. May I point out that most of these school districts are in rural areas where they would not have the financial assets to build the schools that are needed if it were not for Federal assistance.

Mr. REGAN. The gentleman is entirely correct. This school district has increased its valuation for tax purposes for schools two and one-half times since this deluge of military children moved in there. They have reached their financial limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I should like to give you one case as an example, although I know we should not generalize from the particular. Close to Aberdeen we have taken away much of the taxable land that would have been available to the county for the support of the schools. Then by a shift of population we have caused an increased enrollment in the schools in that area by 42 percent. I suggest that we have an obligation to help support these schools, as this program calls for.

(Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I concur in all the arguments which have heretofore been advanced in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] to add \$11,500,000 for Federal assistance in taking care of current expenditures of those schools in the Nation which have felt the impact of Federal activities in their districts. Under Public Law 874 Congress has recognized its obligation in this regard and should therefore appropriate the full funds necessary to meet that obligation. These schools are hard put to take care of the burden which has been placed upon them by the Federal activities that have resulted in great increases in their school population. I do not wish to take the time of the Committee in repeating the arguments already made. I only want to urge the Members to support this amendment and to support also the amendment which Mr. DENTON will later offer to add \$80,000,000 for Federal assistance in construction of additional school facilities which are desperately needed to house the increased school population.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, we have two laws on the statute books here that take care of this situation. I think the Committee on Appropriations is going a long way out of its way to disregard the law that we have on our statute books. We have had to build a school in my town which cost over a million dollars this year, and we have to build another one which will cost nearly a half million dollars. We had to build these schools to take care of the extra children from the camps that surround us. I want to go on record with the rest of these forward-looking gentlemen who have spoken today and expressed the same opinion that I have on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. I regret time will not permit me to give the House some information that they ought to have on this matter. I am the author of Public Laws 874 and 815. As soon as those laws went into effect, the several school districts affected by the Federal impact were asked to submit applications for participation in Federal funds. They did file those applications and were advised by the Federal Commissioner of Education that they would be entitled to so much money for the maintenance and operation of their schools, as a result of the Federal impact. They went ahead and you know, if you know anything about local and county school systems, that there is only one time in the year when you can raise money for the school budget, and that is the time fixed by law. On the strength of this entitlement issued by the Federal Commission of Education, these people went ahead and budgeted those funds as a part of the school budget. The year has elapsed now, and the school year will close on the 30th day of this month. They find their budgets overdrawn because all of that Federal money, which they were promised, was not paid to them. They were paid 75 percent instead of the full 100 percent. The purpose of this \$11,500,000 is to pay them what the Government promised it would pay them, a full 100 percent on the Government's commitment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is absolutely right about it. It is not a local problem. It is a national problem, and because it is a national problem, Congress approved Public Law 874 under which the appropriation is made to take care of the situation. It was my privilege to serve as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the day that the bill was presented. I remember how many tributes were paid from the floor of the House on both sides of the aisle to the committee headed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] and the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from West Virginia, for that remarkable piece of legis-

lation. Now we cannot afford to back down on these commitments. We have made our promise, it amounts to that, and we should carry it through under the terms of the bill that we approved 2 years ago.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not a fact that this is not a case of Federal aid to education, but the prevention of further Federal damage to education?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is a very fine way of putting it, and I am indebted to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio for phrasing it that way.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I heartily endorse all that the gentleman has said regarding this problem. We have a unique situation down in the Fort Knox section of Kentucky, by reason of the acquisition of additional lands to increase the Government area there, that is the Fort itself. But, the little county units have lost the taxes which were collected from that land. So that there is an additional problem which I thought might be pinpointed here to show the difficulties under which the local governments are confronted.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. And that is the result of the Federal operation; is it not?

Mr. CHELF. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the subcommittee investigating housing conditions on the west coast in 1949. We saw situations in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], for example, where the children have never had a full day of schooling. We cannot afford to neglect them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

(Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, of course the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is technically correct. There is no legal obligation, but as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] has said, there is the very strongest sort of moral obligation because our schools have depended upon the enactment of these laws and on the faith of them have incurred obligations. It would be a tragedy if the House of Representatives refused to appropriate the money that is necessary. It is a piddling amount. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], during the consideration of the appropriation bill including items for vocational education, read some astonishing figures. We are actually spending more money on vocational education in foreign countries than we are in America. We simply cannot fail to appropriate this money that these schools need so badly.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman is making a very splendid state-

ment, and I rise for the purpose of urging all Members to vote for this amendment.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Please let me make it clear that I am supporting not only this amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] but also the one that is to follow which would implement Public Law 815 by providing funds for helping local communities suffering from Federal impact to build necessary school buildings to accommodate the children.

The Committee on Appropriations may say that the States have not done their share to provide the necessary buildings for the children who come into the area because of Government installations. That certainly is not true of Georgia for the State has just put into effect what is known as the minimum foundation program for education and has levied a sales tax, a large portion of which goes for educational purposes. In addition, the local communities involved have issued bonds up to the 7-percent limit on assessments fixed by the Georgia Constitution. It is my hope that both of these amendments will be adopted by substantial majorities.

Before taking my seat, I want to say a word of praise for the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] and his subcommittee which includes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] who is offering these amendments and the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] who also favors them. Other members of the committee, I am sure, deserve the same praise for all of them have given their time unselfishly and some of them without any local schools to share in the funds provided by Public Laws 874 and 815.

The gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. CLEVELAND BAILEY, has, in addition, pursued the matter of appropriations through the Budget Bureau and the President to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. And now he joins the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] in leading the fight for the amendments which would add to the appropriation bills the sums which the Committee on Appropriations did not see fit to put in the bill. The school people and the children of our country owe the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] and his subcommittee, as well as the entire Committee on Education and Labor, a debt of gratitude for their splendid, unselfish work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized.

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Denton amendment. I have no criticism, of course, of the committee in its efforts to economize. I think it is to be commended for that. I am generally 100 percent with any committee in that effort. But I cannot support them in cutting out these funds.

I notice in the committee report that the justification for cutting out this 11½ million dollars is that the committee thinks that State and local governments

should make provision for bearing a greater share of these costs, especially under circumstances where an increase in Federal activities results in increased income to the area, as well as an increase in the number of children to be educated. In my home county this reason is not applicable, because that county is largely a county of homes. We have a homestead exemption there. We are faced with the proposition there that it is impossible for us to comply with the suggestion which the committee has made here. Our school authorities have been preparing their plans and are making arrangements, and have made arrangements, relying upon this money, and if it should be cut out they would be at a great disadvantage.

We have built in my home county, using local tax funds, a number of new and modern school buildings, for children of both races. These schools are now overflowing, and that condition is due in considerable measure to the impact of the defense effort in that area. It is only just and fair that the funds provided in the Denton amendments be placed in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] is recognized.

(Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Denton amendment. It is of tremendous importance to me in my district, and particularly to the taxpayers of the towns of Groton and New London, because it will help enable the school boards to pay the current expenses to the extent of the aid to which they are entitled under Public Law 874.

I think all of us recognize that the Federal Government itself must meet its obligations just as it insists that you and I as citizens meet our obligations. I am sure all of us agree that nothing is more important to anyone of us than the proper education of our children.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to endorse all the arguments the gentleman is making in favor of this amendment. I want to say the town of Stratford in my district has made application over a year ago for aid in school construction, and although it has been approved it has not been started because funds are not available. The Government has a big airplane installation in Stratford and the taxpayers of Stratford are punished and their children inadequately educated because of the loss of taxation which would normally accrue to the town if the Government property were owned privately. I am of course a strong economy advocate. But this is a Federal obligation incurred under previous law and is directly a part of our national defense program.

So I support this amendment.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] is recognized.

(Mr. SCHENCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, nothing is more important than the education and development of our children. I spent 7 years from 1941 to 1950 as president of a board of education, so I know something about some of the problems with which schools are faced.

Federal development in many areas has caused a tremendous impact on those areas, and they do need help. Others have shown why they need this help from a financial point of view. It is because the local funds are inadequate, because tax duplicates and legal limits on taxation make it impossible for the local school boards to finance their entire program when they have been highly impacted by these Federal developments.

So I rise in support of the Denton amendment, both the one for maintenance and operation and the one he said he would offer for constructing buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment enthusiastically.

When this legislation was set up there was much discussion as to the need for Federal help in the impacted areas which has not been able to keep pace with the increase in population incident to the defense effort. It was recognized at that time that if it became necessary to spend the billions which we have spent and which we expect to spend building the physical machine with which to fight the war, that it likewise was necessary to recognize the need for education and the part it played in our national defense and to build and maintain the buildings in which could be educated the operators of those machines.

We have one area in my district in which the population has increased one hundredfold in the last 10 years because of the defense effort. If those children are to be educated it is absolutely necessary that this program go through to its complete fulfillment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I think this is one coalition that will be generally approved. I am glad to have so many people on my left and on my right at my side; I am glad to help promote this leadership in this instance.

Have you seen a town grow from 10,000 to 70,000 overnight? I have. We are trying to build for you an H-bomb plant in South Carolina in my distinguished friend's district. If you do not help by implementing our constitution in South Carolina, we cannot operate, and if we do not educate our people, we cannot

afford you leadership. Give us the schools and we will furnish the brains.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. McMULLEN] is recognized.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to say a few words in support of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON]. These amendments to the supplemental appropriations bill call for an increased appropriation for the Office of Education.

It strikes me as being only fair, just, and equitable that the Federal Government should contribute a reasonable amount to the schools which are now overcrowded, and are increasingly becoming more overcrowded, by children whose parents are military personnel or are otherwise employed by the Federal Government. In my opinion, this is not a local problem but a national one. Uncle Sam steps in and takes over a piece of property, thereby removing it from the tax rolls, and it is not fair that the increased school enrollment caused by the Government people moving in should be fully and completely borne by the local taxpayers. For instance, in my district, the Hillsborough County school system is very overcrowded by reason of the great number of children from MacDill Field, Tampa. The local school authorities from Tampa have advised me that it will cost the local taxpayers thousands of dollars—over \$50,000 as a very minimum, above the funds already available—to carry on the routine costs of teaching these youngsters from MacDill Field alone. This illustrates how important it is that the Federal Government bear a part of the burden brought about by the military operations there.

This cannot be honestly called an aid to Federal education. It is actually a fulfillment of a moral obligation of the Government as set forth in Public Law 847 of the Eighty-first Congress. Rather than a Federal aid to education, it could more properly be termed a measure to prevent Federal damage to education.

I want it thoroughly understood that there is no possible chance of any Federal control of the handling or the expenditures of these funds, insofar as the policies of the schools are concerned. The policies would still be in the hands of the local school authorities.

This same supplemental appropriation bill calls for some \$190,000,000 for our point 4 program and some \$4,000,000,000 for our foreign aid or Mutual Security Program. It is my opinion that there is nothing more important to the welfare of our defense efforts than the education of our children. I, therefore, heartily endorse the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana and urge its passage.

(Mr. McMULLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMULLEN. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman to yield in order that I might make this brief statement. I think everyone here knows my position

of this question of unnecessary expenditures. As has been pointed out, however, we have an obligation here not to Europe, not to point 4, not to the far-flung corners of the earth, but we have an obligation to our own school children at home in these impacted areas.

This bill carries approximately \$190,000,000 for point 4 for foreign countries. All told, there is in this bill approximately \$6,500,000,000 for foreign aid. The money appropriated by the gentleman's amendment is just as much a part of the defense effort as the guns, the planes, and the ships. Let us support this amendment and cut out something else and economize later on in this bill where cuts can be more appropriately made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to plead with this Committee to pass not only this amendment but also the other amendment to be introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON]. The passage of these amendments is absolutely vital to certain counties in my district. You can talk about your business, or your wheat crop, your cotton crop, your corn crop, but the most precious crop you have is your children crop. Down in one county in my district the population increased by 50 percent on account of a military installation and the families who moved in there did so to further the defense effort. Their children make up 50 percent of the pupils of that county and has created a burden that county cannot handle and should not be expected to handle. Georgia has a compulsory school attendance law, and it is obligatory that children attend school. The committee states that counties asking for aid fail to take into consideration the advantages derived from military installations. In some instances the advantages are few. Sometimes the advantages are obtained by larger cities in another county lying just a few miles away, as happens to be the case I am citing. I want to say to the splendid committee that if they do not have the problems I have mentioned, that when they do, they will realize what headaches they are. The county school superintendents and school boards can tell you what they are. The State of Georgia and the county I mentioned are paying over \$525,000 this year for education in that county. If these amendments are passed, the Government will be paying only about one-fourth of what the State and county are paying, although children brought in because of the military installation, and who are rightfully the responsibility of the Government, total 50 percent of the school children. You can pass these amendments with assurance that the Government is really getting a big bargain, in fact, the Government is effecting a saving of 50 percent. To fail to pass these amendments will simply mean that in certain counties of my district, the large areas are removed from the tax books because the lands are owned by the Government, that the people living away from

the Federal area will have the burden of supporting such schools. Counties in my district have carried this burden as long as they can. These counties look to the fairness of Congress, expecting aid in this problem that they did not invite. I confidently expect Congress to give this aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] that there be added to the school funds the sum of \$11,500,000. I am pleased to add my voice to that of the 12 or 15 Members who have already risen and spoken for this increase to this appropriation. I believe it is necessary and timely that this sum be made available as soon as possible. Yes; it could be made later, but the objectives of Public Law 874 will be made more effective, in my judgment, if it is made at this time. Also it now appears that this additional sum is logically necessary to accomplish the desired objectives which this Congress last year approved.

Nor do I criticize the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations who voiced opposition to this increase, for certainly we expect them to be very conservative and careful and considerate of the amounts they approve and the causes for which they approve appropriation moneys. But, Mr. Chairman, I cannot go along with the argument of the committee members that we have no obligation to add this \$11,500,000 because there is no technical contractual relationship between the United States and any of these impacted school districts which will benefit by this additional sum. I was pleased to hear the distinguished gentleman, a member of the Rules Committee, that his support of this additional amount was based on the premise that he believed it to be part of our national defense. So do I so believe. I was pleased also to hear the gentleman from Michigan state that he enthusiastically supported it. I believe that not only this \$11,500,000 additional sum should be today voted by way of amendments to the supplemental appropriation bill, but I am ready to vote for the \$80,000,000 for school construction costs in federally impacted areas over the Nation, which I am told by the distinguished gentleman [Mr. DENTON], a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling this bill, will be the subject matter of a second amendment. Having been informed by several of the distinguished school administrators and executives in the great congressional district which I represent that both of these sums are absolutely necessary in certain portions of my congressional district, as well as dozens of

other impacted school districts, I therefore know that I am reliably informed; I know these able and patriotic school administrators and executives well enough personally to personally rely upon their representations and give them always full faith and credence. Furthermore, I personally am acquainted with and personally observed many of the results of the impact of Federal installations and programs upon certain of the school districts in my congressional district in my native State. Therefore, I shall be pleased to vote for this amendment and, in a few minutes, when the gentleman's amendment for \$80,000,000 comes before us, I shall again actively support that amendment. Both are timely and in the best interests of the destiny of our beloved Nation. For, Mr. Chairman, what our Nation is to be, our children in our schools are beginning.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and admiration for my colleague on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], I believe he is one of the most conscientious, one of the hardest working Members of Congress; and because of the respect I have for him I find it very difficult to appear in the well of the House this afternoon and oppose an amendment he has offered.

There has been a great deal of talk about the obligation we owe to these various school districts under the legislation we enacted in 1950. There is no legal obligation on the Federal Government to meet 100 percent these entitlements. There has been no way to date that the committee has been able to check on the authenticity of these applications that have been received in the Department of Education. The Department of Education has admitted itself that it has found several discrepancies in the applications received that it is now just beginning to catch up with. The Department has not been able to screen all applications.

Last year we granted them enough money to meet 96 percent of the entitlements and for 1952 we appropriated \$40,000,000 which will allow them to meet 76 percent of these entitlements.

I know there are many school districts throughout the country where we have a definite obligation to assist because of Federal activities that have added to the burdens of the schools without any financial gain to the community, but, Mr. Chairman, under section 3 of this bill there are no eligibility requirements that relate to financial need and we are asked to appropriate, under section 3, about \$41,000,000 of the \$51,000,000 that they claim is necessary to meet 100 percent of entitlements. As an example, in the area around the city of Washington—in Alexandria, Arlington, Prince Georges, Montgomery, and these various other counties surrounding Washington, where they are reducing their taxes in this fiscal year—we are asked to appropriate in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000 to help maintain and operate the schools. At the same time they are reducing their taxes. That is the absolute fact. Regardless of

whether or not there is financial need in such school districts we are giving them the money. As I said before, I know that there are many districts where there is a financial need and where it is an obligation of the Federal Government. Those districts should be helped. But you take a navy yard or an old army depot that has been in existence in some city for 25 or 30 years, that district is eligible under the act to receive their portion of these Federal grants even though they may have gotten along with no great difficulty or Federal assistance for years.

I have heard expressed before on the floor of the House that we do not want Federal aid to medical education, that we would get some kind of Federal control over the schools. I have heard it argued in this House that we should never give any grants to medical schools to assist in their cost of operation and maintenance. They say, "Do not give any grants at all, because once you take a grant there will be control." But, we do not hear anything today about the danger of controls over education following these grants.

Under the Lanham Act, during the last war, from 1941 to 1946, all we appropriated for the maintenance and operation of these schools in federally impacted areas was about \$43,000,000; that was all. Up to date we have appropriated about \$100,000,000 since the passage of this act in September 1950, for this same thing.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Ford) there were—ayes 147, noes 40.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENTON: On page 8, after line 20, insert:

"School construction: For an additional amount for school construction, \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this is practically along the same line as the other amendment we just adopted. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this amendment involves considerably more money. There is approximately \$80,000,000 involved in this amendment. I sincerely hope the House will take a little bit more than 20 minutes to discuss it. It might take me almost that long to explain why I am in favor of larger expenditures for this program.

Mr. BAILEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. BAILEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the other half of the same program, and comes under Public Law 815 of the Eighty-first Congress. It deals with the construction of school buildings in Federal-impact areas. We have already appropriated \$135,000,000 for this construction program, and the \$80,000,000, which my amendment adds to this appropriation, will clean up the program. All of the applications for construction grants must be in by the 30th of this month. They can make an estimate, and they have agreed that this will be the end of this construction program under Public Law 815.

When the House Education and Labor Committee made their investigation, they found situations all over the country which I think were very much like one which existed in my district. In my district, the Government came in and built a powder plant and a bag-loading plant. That took 40 percent of the taxable property off the taxable list, because the Government owned it. When the Government is through with their present work they will have spent \$240,000,000 on that project. Here is 40 percent of the property taken off the taxable list, and a \$240,000,000 installation set-up there which cannot be taxed. One part of the installation is operated by du Pont, and the other by Goodyear, on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract.

These installations are just like any other factories. If they were privately owned, you could see exactly what taxable property we would have. But say they had property valued at \$100,000,000 for taxation, and we are limited to 2 percent in Indiana on bonded indebtedness. Most of the States are. Most of these school buildings have to be built through issuing bonds. You can see how easy the problem would be. We could build schools costing as much as \$2,000,000.

As it is, however, they cannot raise any money to build schools. To make matters worse, the school population of that community has almost quadrupled. There are almost four times as many children there now as there were before Federal impact. The schools are absolutely inadequate. There was no way they could build more schools. So the children had to go to school in an administration building in the powder plant.

In this particular case, the school building has been authorized and is being constructed now. So as far as I am concerned, my community is taken care of. However, we have a good many communities that have not been taken care of.

This situation came about for this reason: You remember that in the last

session of Congress we passed a bill which provided for schools and other facilities in defense areas. The President, for a reason that does not affect the question, vetoed the bill. That meant that many Federal-impact areas were created that were not in existence when basic legislation was passed, around Paducah, Savannah River, Texarkana, and places like that. Those were critical situations. The money that was to have gone to build many schools in previously existing impact areas was allocated to these particular new areas. As a result, the Government made commitments and told these people—these are the smaller areas that are left now—that they could go ahead and construct their school buildings. Some of them have gone so far as to issue bonds. They have bought land. They are all ready to build the schools, and they are waiting for the Government to pay its share of the money.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I believe I understood the gentleman to say this \$80,000,000 should complete the program.

Mr. DENTON. That is right.

Mr. BUSBEY. I call the attention of the gentleman to the testimony of Mr. Lillywhite on pages 235 and 236 of the hearings. That does not coincide with what he told us.

Mr. DENTON. You notice further that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] had an agreement with the Budget Bureau, and Mr. Stephens had an agreement with them that, under Public Law 815, this was the end of the program. I think that is right, is it not?

The Budget Bureau has approved this. This is the same problem as we had before, under Public Law 874. This is an obligation of the Federal Government. You say it is not a legal obligation? Why, certainly, the Federal Government ought to be a good citizen. When you own property, there is a certain responsibility in connection with such ownership. You have to take care of the roads; you have to support the schools; you have to pay for fire and police protection. While the Government may not be legally obligated to do it, it certainly is morally obligated to do it in the impact areas.

I want to see my Government a fair government. That is all we are doing in this program. We are being a fair government. As I said before, this will close up the school construction program under Public Law 815. These people have obligated themselves in accordance with the assurances we have given to them. Compared to the amount of money we are spending for other programs, this expenditure is infinitesimal. This problem arises from exactly the same conditions which have caused all the other expenditures under the defense program, and I certainly hope that the House will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

(By unanimous consent (and at their request), the time allotted to Mr. LANHAM, Mr. SCHENCK, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. TOLLEFSON was given to Mr. BARDEN.)

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen so much, but I do not want to impose myself too long on the Members of the House.

This legislation was handled by the Committee on Education and Labor. It was a well-thought-out bill. The bill provides for the construction of school buildings. The formula is a very carefully prepared formula, and it has operated well all over the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we need not discuss too much, I think, the actual responsibility of the Federal Government. Let us think a little too of the emergencies that exist and of the school construction that is absolutely necessary. There would have been considerably more money for use in other sections of this country had it not been for the construction of the Savannah River project which took a great amount of the money for needed school buildings that could have been used in this program for other areas. This amount of money, \$80,000,000, will close up the program. That is the general concession made by all. I say to this House in all sincerity, being familiar with the manner in which the department has handled this program, and the care they have exercised in selecting the eligible areas that I think they have done a good job. And I would remind the House that I am hard to please when it comes to administrators. I want to say this too, Mr. Chairman, normally I think I am a fairly conservative fellow, or at least I am generally accepted as such. But I certainly would not care to be so conservative that I could not recognize a real existing need and an emergency in this situation.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. I am sure the gentleman is as much interested as I am in seeing that no further Federal control be instigated in this case. I know that a great many Members on this side are very much interested in preventing any further control going from the States to the Federal Government. I wonder if the gentleman can assure that the minimum of control of the educational policies is present in this particular bill.

Mr. BARDEN. If there is any man in America who is thoroughly conscious of the possibility of that at all times, I believe I can qualify. There is absolutely not one particle of opportunity for any Federal control, interference, or direction of policy. This is for the actual building of school buildings for the children to go to school in, and the money is turned over to the local authorities and they build the buildings. We safeguarded that in every possible way.

I went to the Savannah River project, and I had a delegation of fine women come to me and then I went out and looked at the situation. They were in real distress. Those kids had nothing to say about where they were carried

or where they should live, but there they were with no school buildings and something had to be done. We are more or less inclined to think that some way will be provided but faith alone will not build them school buildings. I say to you in all sincerity there are some Federal impact or defense areas where these buildings are needed that local taxes cannot be provided. There is no need to stand here and abuse a community for doing its best. We have had considerable expansion of Federal Government ownership of property that normally would be taxable property. I think we should pass a law and let the Federal Government, when it moves into a community and takes a certain amount of property from the tax books, pay its proportionate part of the tax as any other citizen in that county or State should pay. Once we do that we will do away with the necessity of coming in here trying to work out a so-called piecemeal program.

On this list of buildings for which construction is needed at this time are applications from various communities and various States where perhaps there is only a small percentage difference between the community that receives funds for the school building and the community that does not receive funds for a school building. That list of unfortunate applications is approved, accepted, they are worthy, and they are qualified under the law this House passed almost unanimously. I may say that not one single complaint has been offered about the operation of this law. It is a safeguarded program, but when you have these applications and on one side you say, "Well, you would get this money if there were two more children," and to another, "Yes you get your money application A because you have in school two more children than applicant B that is a very arbitrary way to say who is worthy and who is unworthy. But there had to be some way of saying who should get help. This money will help the rest of the qualified applicants.

I sincerely hope this House will add the \$80,000,000 provided for in the amendment. It is needed and it is for our own American folks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, supplementing what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has just said, may I say to you that this \$80,000,000 will involve 274 districts that the Federal Commissioner of Education had no funds to distribute to them because the money was diverted and used in the construction of building facilities at places like Aiken, Paducah, and Texarkana. This is to make good the promise of the Government. When these people were told they were to have this money they went ahead and voted bonds, made special levies, and they are ready to start the school projects, and there is no Federal money available.

Let me say to you I have a list of the names of the school districts. There

are 7 in Alabama, 9 in Arizona, 18 in California, 3 in Colorado, 7 in Georgia, 5 in Idaho, 10 in Indiana, 5 in Iowa, 5 in Kansas, 6 in Kentucky, 6 in Maine, 3 in Massachusetts, 4 in Maryland, 9 in Michigan, 7 in Minnesota, 7 in Missouri, 3 in Nebraska, 2 in Nevada, 2 in New Hampshire, 6 in New Jersey, 1 in Connecticut, 4 in North Carolina, 3 in North Dakota, 16 in Ohio, 4 in Oklahoma, 8 in Oregon, 4 in Pennsylvania, 3 in South Carolina, and 8 in Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. I am sorry I do not have an opportunity to tell you where these districts are, but they are Nationwide.

[Mr. WERDEL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, what I said in regard to the previous amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] a little while ago, and which was adopted by an overwhelming vote by this committee, applies as well to this amendment. I rise now simply to indicate to what extent the board of education of one school district in my congressional district has gone to provide facilities or schoolrooms for the children. They obtained prefabricated wooden barracks once used for soldiers, and are now housing some of their children in those buildings. They moved them a long distance, repaired them, patched them up, and are making them do in order to provide schoolrooms for these children in the Livonia district in the metropolitan area of Detroit.

The impact of the Federal Government in that area because of the defense program is the reason why that district and the people of that district, now Livonia City, have exhausted all legal and financial means in an effort to provide school facilities for their children.

This amendment should be adopted. I am in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, if you will turn to page 236 of the hearings you will find that this \$80,000,000 does not conclude this program, because the man in charge of administering it testified:

In the requirements under the other sections of the act there will be roughly \$198,000,000 still standing on the books.

There are about 1,600 construction projects.

The pending amendment was brought into the committee on 2 hours' notice; it was cleared by the budget only late the night before. There was no time for anyone to give proper consideration to this appropriation. We can very well

consider voting down this amendment because in January a new Congress comes in and it will have plenty of time to consider the appropriation as it should be considered.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I have not time to yield.

One thing more: This discriminates about as badly as any law we have on the books; for instance, in my district in the city of Chicago I have a 100 percent Federally impacted area, yet we cannot qualify for a nickel under this law.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the emotional appeals made here today for the education of our children. I agree 100 percent that everything possible should be done to see that the children in the United States are properly educated. But I wish to call attention to the fact that our subcommittee has already recommended and the House approved \$135,000,000 for this program for the fiscal year 1953, and no harm will be done if this \$80,000,000 is held in abeyance until some future date.

These Federally impacted areas are the result of our defense program and the moneys for the program should be appropriated in the defense budget. To give one illustration of how impractical the program is operated under the present law, we only have to look around us at such nearby communities as Arlington and Alexandria, Va. At the present time they are actually reducing their taxes, but still these two communities, with other surrounding communities, would be entitled to receive approximately \$1,000,000 of this appropriation. All the large cities of the United States, such as Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, Detroit and many others, cannot participate to the extent of 1 penny, notwithstanding the fact that they have also had an impact in certain sections of their cities due to the defense program.

Even during World War II when we passed the Lanham Act to help build schools in Federally impacted areas we only appropriated \$50,000,000 from 1941 to 1946. This program, if continued under the present formula will cost the taxpayers many hundreds of millions of dollars. As a matter of fact, if this amendment stays in the supplemental appropriation bill there will be a total amount of \$215,000,000 and that will not start to take care of the entitlements that the various communities think they are qualified to receive.

We had testimony before our committee that the applications are coming in so fast that they do not even have a chance to check them. The practical thing to do is to hold any consideration of this additional \$80,000,000 in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] in abeyance until after January 3. The men responsible for administering this school construction program should have a chance to ascertain just exactly what the requirements are, how much it will cost, and then report back to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Federal Security after the first of the year.

In conclusion, I wish to assure the Members that the school construction program will not be hindered one iota by not allowing this additional \$80,000,000. I sincerely trust the amendment will be defeated.

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is recognized.

(Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, just a minute ago you heard the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], who last year with his special subcommittee has already done such valiant work in the field of study and action in the matter of what the Federal Government's responsibility is as relates to the school children in these impacted areas all over our great Nation, read a list of States of the United States which had these affected areas and the number of such areas in each of said States. Therefore, you heard him read from the list that my native State of California had 18 such Federal active areas in it. But, Mr. Chairman, the distinguished Representative from West Virginia in making that reference to the 18 such areas was using a broader breakdown or classification for I am reliably informed that at this particular time there are 190 such impacted school districts in my native State of California. It is clear, therefore, that the 18 areas which he referred to are much more extensive geographically than just the local school districts which I specify. Therefore, both of us are right numerically.

This, as I recall it, is at least twice as many as any other State in the Union. Another pertinent fact showing the extent to which California has so rapidly increased population-wise in this last decade is the fact that January 1953 the State of California will be represented by seven additional Members of this House of Representatives. This, of course, on account of the increase in population according to the last census. This congressional membership increase also, I believe, is twice as many additional Representatives in Congress as any other State. I mention these two items of material evidence as to the population growth in connection with my vigorous support of the gentleman's amendment to add \$80,000,000 for school construction in these impacted areas during the next year because one of the logical reasons for this great increase of population and influx into the State of California from other States is the fact of there having been constructed in my State so many national defense installations; or, for the reason that so many great industrial plants and factories there have now of necessity turned their total production to the necessity of defending our national security and defense against aggressive communism.

And many of these 18 impacted areas referred to by the gentleman from West Virginia are in Los Angeles County, a

vital portion of which county I have the honor to represent in this great legislative body. Also, my particular congressional district has several of these concerned school districts. As it is always true and timely that we keep up our obligations to help protect the peace of the world by being strong enough to help preserve the peace against threatened communistic or military aggression or dictatorships, so it is always timely and no less important that we never neglect our own home domestic front and our school districts in this Nation by neglecting to assume an honorable and prompt discharge of any Federal obligation which exists toward providing for adequate school buildings and facilities. If we neglect the education of our children for a generation our national existence will surely be jeopardized and our destiny made uncertain. An unschooled, illiterate childhood resulting from no school facilities or inadequate school facilities places that child in line for becoming an adult liability. I do not have to point up to you, my distinguished colleagues in this House of Representatives, any further my viewpoint as to the value and place of importance of children of school age in shaping the destiny of our Nation. I assume I have your 100-percent concurrence with my statements on this premise.

This \$80,000,000 will enable the school districts throughout the Nation to complete the school building construction upon which they embarked in whole or in part because they were led to believe that the Federal Government would continue cooperatively with each of these school districts which had already received some funds under Public Law 815 until their building projects were completed.

Yes, I agree that there is no technical legal obligation or contract on the part of Uncle Sam to vote and distribute this additional \$80,000,000 at this time. But, Mr. Chairman, there is the moral obligation which is as clear cut as the finest diamond in existence. They expended their moneys to date in full faith and confidence that when the time came we of Congress would vote the necessary moneys to make their initial building program complete. Therefore no less than complete compliance on the basis of good faith and confidence should be tolerated. Nor, in stating this conclusion do I criticize our splendid Subcommittee on Appropriations. They have made it clear that their thought was that this money could be added at a later date but in the matter of school facilities and construction in my native State, Mr. Chairman, time is of the essence. Thousands of school children are in part-time sessions. Therefore, there is no time like the present to begin more fully to provide absolutely necessary school buildings for the children of our Nation. The States and school districts are doing their share. We of this great Congress ought to provide the share of the United States Government to the same essential objective.

Before I became a Member of this legislative body, I had the benefit and

enjoyment of serving as a member of the Board of Education of the State of California and if I had not already been a strong believer-supporter of the schools of my State, and an appreciative recipient of public school educational advantages, my term of service on the State board, at which time I personally gained much information and knowledge of such matters, I came to the conclusion that any time and opportunity when I could emphasize the worthwhileness and essentiality of education for children, I would do so. I cannot now recall any proposed amendment to any bill on the floor of this House during my three terms already served in this Congress which received such a spontaneous, sincere, and emphatic support from the membership on the floor. I am glad it is so—it should be so. And the fact that dozens of Members are arising to this emergency and urging that this \$80,000,000 be now made available is invigorating and should give concrete evidence to the people of America that the United States Congress not only believes in the children of America but believes emphatically that the children of America be well schooled and while they are obtaining their schooling that they be housed well in adequate school buildings and with adequate school facilities. For these reasons and others which I do not have time to here relate, I urge you, my colleagues, to vote this amendment to strengthen the hands of Public Law 815.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

I am pleased the House saw fit to approve the previous amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana which provides \$11,500,000 for maintenance and operations of schools affected by Federal impact and I am hopeful it will again exercise good judgment and support this amendment to provide \$80,000,000 for Federal assistance in construction.

Congress, I feel, is under a moral obligation to fulfill its contract with school districts in these Federal impact areas. Unless we provide the funds in this bill, districts which have been compelled to expand school facilities far beyond normal needs to take care of children channeled into their systems because of Federal operations in their areas, will be under a severe handicap.

I have had first-hand knowledge and experience regarding Federal impact on local school systems. Four or five districts in Madison and St. Clair Counties in Illinois have been forced to construct new buildings and to expand facilities to take care of a great influx of children because of defense programs. The districts affected normally would not have their present heavy load which creates financial problems they cannot solve without Federal assistance.

All these districts have cooperated with the Office of Education in working out programs to take care of the Federal impact and they have done so with the understanding the Federal Government would bear its share of the burden. We should make certain here today that the Government fulfills its agreements.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with the purposes of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON]. I hope it passes. It is a very worthy amendment. Western Pennsylvania needs additional money to educate its children.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to vote for the preceding amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], for, of course, a smaller amount, which had reference to maintenance and operation of these crowded schools. This amendment by the same gentleman is far more vital than the other and also larger in amount.

As the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] said, there are nine schools to which this legislation applies in the State of Arizona, one of them in my home town. I know about them personally because I am acquainted with the situation. To illustrate, when I came to the Congress one of these school districts was out in the country. You could look out from the front door of the administration building and see nothing but three or four farm houses. Today that same area is a solid city with a great war production manufacturing plant within about two blocks of the school itself, mostly of Federal housing. So I know what I am talking about, both as to the crowded condition of the schools and of the restricted tax base.

In my State of Arizona there is a bond debt limit for school districts. The school districts cannot go beyond that limit. These districts have taxed themselves to the limit, they have issued the limit in bonds; therefore we must have this additional help if we are going to meet our obligations to those children and the Government's obligation to those districts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this amendment providing funds for the building of school houses means the elimination of double sessions in the schools in many districts of the United States. Those of you who are familiar with this vicious practice appreciate that it is not a good one.

May I point out that the projects submitted under the law are very carefully screened. There are no monumental buildings involved. The buildings authorized are functional in type and they are kept to a minimum cost. The cost of construction of many of the buildings projected by the schools has gone up since this law went into effect. The whole situation has been dislocated on account of increased costs. While I hope the program may be concluded with the appropriation of this sum of money, I point out that the problem is a continuing one and it depends on what we do here in Congress and what the Federal Government in its defense effort does in the location of establishments necessary to the defense effort as to whether or not it can be concluded.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I referred to California in my question on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana a moment ago. I would like to confirm what the gentleman has said about the situation in California because as a member of the subcommittee investigating conditions there I found this situation to be true.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, the two or three words I have to say will not be said with any hope or much desire of defeating this amendment, but simply in defense of the Committee on Appropriations, in order that this RECORD, which shows laudable efforts of many Members to take care of their districts and communities, will also show the position of our committee. Not all but most of the communities having these problems went out and sought the military installations and the defense plants that are there located. Those plants brought into most of those communities large payrolls, money that goes to the butcher, the baker, the candlestick-maker. Most of the States in which these installations are located have little or no debt, while the Federal Government is wallowing in it. These facts should be borne in mind. Even though the testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor had great appeal and that committee acted sincerely, it is still the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to examine this program and provide the money with caution.

Many of these communities which are fortunate in having defense plants want to have their cake and eat it, too. They believe the Federal Treasury is inexhaustible. They may kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

(Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, there is just one suggestion that I might make to some of my friends who have these educational problems in these federally impacted areas, and that is that they get the State Department to declare their area foreign territory and then they will not have any trouble; there will be no question raised as to receiving Federal funds.

In support of that suggestions, I might remind you that during last year, for the financing of just one little facet of the educational picture, vocational education, your Government and mine spent \$30,000,000 importing students to this country to teach them vocational education.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia yielding to me. I want to correct a wrong impression that was given by the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Committee on Appropriations. The 30th day of this month, next Monday, will be the last day that anybody can make any request for assistance under Public Law 815. No further appropriations can be made unless they are made here today under Public Law 815.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know about how well or how poorly this is administered, and I certainly do not want to defend the tardiness of the budget request. But I know about this problem as it applies to my district, and if the problem is as acute elsewhere, the Federal Government is not doing its duty. It is not a question of Federal aid to education; it is a question of preventing further Federal injury to education. There are two of these Federal impact school districts in my congressional district. For instance, you have all heard about Lustron. That expensive and tragic experiment, I regret to say, took place in my district in a factory that had been making aircraft. When Lustron died, unwept and unsung, the Navy took title to the factory and put North American Aircraft in there to make airplanes for the national defense. The employees poured in and the children poured into Jefferson local school district. Taking that plant off the tax duplicate cut off about 40 percent of the tax resources of that district. Only a few years ago this school district built a new school, bonding itself almost to the limit under Ohio laws. Children from nearby Federal installations promptly filled up the school, but even under these two laws nothing was allowed to help pay for the bonds, even though the Government would have had to provide construction money if the school had not been built by the local district. Now, that new school is full and overflowing and the district cannot issue bonds within the statutory limit

for the necessary additional construction. It is not merely unfair; it is impossible for this district to carry the load forced on it by the Federal Government's defense build-up. Our Government must be just before it is generous and these districts ask not generosity but justice. This amendment should be adopted.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record).

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment appropriating funds to assist in the construction of school buildings and in carrying on the school programs in defense-impacted areas. I think the people of each community and State should do everything they can to take care of their school problems and expenditures. This legislation is for assistance in areas where the Government has placed defense installations. The responsibility for the additional expense is created because of the unusual number of people brought to these areas for so-called war work. So, taking care of and educating the extra number of families is more than the taxpayers of the community can handle. It therefore becomes necessary to call upon the Federal Government to render assistance in a situation where the Government is at least partly responsible. I think such funds should be used only after it is clearly shown that an unusual situation exists because of defense operations, and where it is shown the local communities have done all they should to provide their share of the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING].

[Mr. IRVING addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. IRVING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

(Mr. BAKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I call to the attention of the Committee the fact that the district I represent is probably affected more than any district in the United States due to Oak Ridge. About half the workers of Oak Ridge live in Oak Ridge and their children go to school there. The other half live in such nearby towns as Knoxville, Harriman, Lenoir City, Browderstown, Kingston, Loudon, Clinton, Lake City, and Rockwood. Some 35,000 or 40,000 workers from all over the world live there. The conditions in the schools in those adjoining towns are desperate. The children go to school in cloak rooms, gymnasiums, and in the halls. Sanitary conditions are bad. Danger of fire is inherent at all times. There has been one fire in the Harriman School that I think was directly due to the overcrowded con-

ditions caused by the influx of these defense workers.

Replying to the gentleman from New Hampshire as to Oak Ridge, nobody asked for Oak Ridge to come to Tennessee. The first anybody knew about it, a large number of condemnation suits had been filed. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, these people came up before the committee on the 17th of June on a request for a deficiency item. They had previously been allowed \$135,000,000 in the regular labor-Federal security appropriation bill. At that time the committee expected that that would be the story. All of us expected that. If we go ahead and allow a terrific lot of money in this case, \$80,000,000 on top of \$135,000,000 makes \$215,000,000. That is a terrific lot of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and hope it will not prevail.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. It would seem to me we were going far enough when we provided \$135,000,000, that has not become available to them and which has not yet been allocated. I know they say they can allocate it in a minute, but we know they cannot allocate it in a minute if they do a good, honest job.

I think this think ought to rest just where it is, with the \$135,000,000 which is not in dispute and which has not been used and which will not be used, until after the conference on that bill is completed. It is not in disagreement. But it seems to me we have gone far enough with it at this time, and we ought to stop.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman agree that this could well stay over until January?

Mr. TABER. It would be better to have them do a good job, allocating what money they have to allocate, than to have them make a mess out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the same position again in opposing the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON]. Some members who have spoken on this amendment this afternoon would try to make you believe we want to kill the program. That is not the fact at all. As the gentleman from New York has just pointed out, since there is no disagreement between the House and the Senate, we have in effect already appropriated \$135,000,000 for this program for the next fiscal year. That money has not been allocated as yet. Technically, it has not been appropriated. When we were hearing testimony on this bill, back in February, they said then that they were before the Bureau of the Budget for an

additional supplemental appropriation at the same time they were coming to us for the regular appropriation. The Budget Bureau refused that supplemental appropriation of \$215,000,000. It was not until the 16th of June, the day before we held these hearings which was on the 17th, that the Bureau of the Budget all at once and without much preparation O. K.'d this justification for \$80,000,000. On June 17 we held this hearing. The budget officer said:

We have some information, Mr. Chairman, and part of the original estimates that were estimated originally. This came so suddenly we didn't get the regularly prepared justification, but he will discuss it.

And Mr. Lillywhite said:

The first thing I knew about this, Mr. Chairman, was a telephone call last night that this might be up today.

Now there you have it. A telephone call the night before asking for an appropriation of \$80,000,000, and then these people from the Office of Education appeared before our committee on that afternoon with no preparation at all. That is all admitted, and then they ask us as a committee to O. K. this appropriation. We are not against the program, we believe in the program and have already appropriated \$135,000,000 because we think it is a good program, but at least we want to have these departments justify such expenditures when they appear before us. They did not justify them. Now you are telling the House today that this has been justified. They were not justified before the committee, and that is why the committee could not go along with this request.

(Mr. SCHENCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Denton amendment to provide \$80,000,000 for the construction of very badly needed school buildings.

It is an accepted fact that the birth rate in the United States has continued at an increased rate since the beginning of World War II. The impact of these new children plus the shifting of population as the result of military installations and defense production has caused tremendous need for school rooms. Children certainly deserve a proper seat in a school room and I am sure none of us are willing to run our schools on a double shift basis in order to accommodate these children.

An examination of the amount of tax duplicates in various areas indicates a wide variance in the amount of taxable property behind each student. Also many school districts are already levying the maximum legal amount of taxes and have no other place from which to secure this necessary fund because other sources of tax funds are not open to them.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is only right and proper that Federal funds should be spent for necessary school buildings. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we can afford huge sums of money in building all sorts of installations in foreign countries we can cer-

tainly afford to spend money for our own children here in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DENTON), there were—ayes 115, noes 74.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. DENTON and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 109, noes 62.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to announce that the United States Senate has just voted to override the President's veto of the immigration bill even as we voted to override it yesterday. The vote in the Senate was 57 to 26.

The removal of racial bars from our immigration and naturalization laws represents for many people in this House, including myself, 10 long years of hard work. When I first came here, I said that if I could help get this injustice removed, it would be worth my giving up my profession to enter political life. For without this act there will not be peace in Asia. It is worth divisions to our side and destroys the strongest propaganda weapon the Communists had against us.

We recognize that the bill does not remove all the inequities in existing law, but it does remove a great many; the President's veto, if sustained, would continue them all—as ill-liberal a course as I can imagine. I congratulate particularly the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER and Mr. GRAHAM] for the long, meticulous study they have given to this legislation, and their leadership in carrying it through to this successful conclusion.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to advise my colleagues of the House that the Committee on Education and Labor has under consideration a very important piece of legislation to provide for greater safety in the mines.

I want to advise my colleagues that we had another explosion in a mine in West Virginia last night that killed four miners and injured a fifth miner so badly he is not expected to live.

I just want to call the attention of the House to the necessity for action on this legislation before we adjourn.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. Could the gentleman give us some idea when this legislation might be considered on the House floor?

Mr. BAILEY. It will be acted on before the day is over.

(Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE Construction

For an additional amount for "Construction," \$525,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That restrictions contained within the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952, limiting the amounts which may be expended from appropriations to the National Park Service for personal services, are hereby waived to the extent necessary to meet the costs of fire suppression and of emergency reconstruction or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 10, line 15, after the word "construction", strike out "\$525,000" and insert "\$5,525,000"; and on line 16, before the semicolon insert the following: "\$5,000,000 of which shall be used for the construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway, as authorized by law."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the other Members of the House are as much disturbed as I am over the possibility of an atomic war. In my opinion we are facing a most serious condition.

This Natchez Trace project means more, from that standpoint, than any other highway in America. It extends from Nashville, Tenn., to Natchez, Miss., where the road crosses the river and goes on to New Orleans.

Nashville is about half-way between our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge and the one we now have at Paducah, Ky. Nashville is connected with both those plants by splendid highways.

Let us see what this Natchez Trace would mean: It would mean a straight paved highway along the route Andrew Jackson marched in 1814 on his way to New Orleans to win the final battle of the War of 1812. All road crossings are eliminated. Cross roads are carried either under or above the Natchez Trace. This means that in case of military necessity everything can be excluded from this highway except military traffic, without in any way interfering with the traffic in the area through which it passes.

It is the most important highway from that standpoint in the United States. It is the only one that will furnish an exclusive route from our two atomic bomb plants all the way to the Gulf.

In case we do not have a war, it would be the finest passenger highway for

north and south traffic to be found anywhere in the United States, since all bus and truck traffic is excluded. It would be confined to passenger traffic and would save the lives of many of those 37,000 people who are killed in automobile accidents every year.

This project is already under way. It is 449 miles long. A large portion of it has already been constructed. The right-of-way for the rest of it has either been acquired or can be acquired at any time. That is supplied by the States through which it passes.

The longer we drag this project out the more it will cost. It is economy to speed up this construction as much as possible and get it completed as early as we can. In addition to the economy of speeding up this construction, as I said, it is the outstanding highway of America from the standpoint of national defense.

I sincerely trust that the Members will support my amendment and help us to speed up its construction, and not let it drag out, thereby multiplying the cost, during a time when we never know when we will need it and need it badly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. Chairman, the responsibility falls upon me to say something regarding this amendment since the Interior section of the bill has been reached and this amendment has to do with that section. I am the ranking member present of the Interior subcommittee on appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with my good friend from Mississippi that this is a great memorial highway. I have been interested in it for years. One year I succeeded in getting the subcommittee to allow in excess of the Budget estimate for this highway.

But there is no construction money for roads in this bill. There is no money in the bill for road construction in any of our national parks. If you add this \$5,000,000 you will single out this one project and give it preferred treatment. While I would like to see it get larger appropriations, I do not think this is the way to legislate. I favor the construction of this parkway. The gentleman knows that the Subcommittee on Appropriations has always allowed the full budget estimates. On at least one occasion we allowed in excess of the budget estimate.

I hope the Committee will not adopt the amendment. Then I can tell the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that he will certainly have a friend in court if he will bring the matter to our subcommittee next year.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. You are appropriating over \$6,000,000,000 in this bill to send to foreign countries or \$2,000,000 for every country. It is far more important that we appropriate funds to defend our own country than it is to build

power dams, highways and flood control projects all over the world at the expense of the American taxpayers. This project is necessary from a military standpoint.

Mr. NORRELL. I agree with the gentleman that this is a good highway to spend money on, but I do not want to ask for any money for my State or for my section that is not also equally shared in the other areas of the country. Although I am sympathetic to this highway I do not feel that this is the way to do it.

Mr. RANKIN. When you speak about sections of the country, if we get into an atomic war, every section of America will be interested in having a highway ingress and egress to and from these atomic bomb plants.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say about atomic warfare that it is bad, I will go along with that, but that has nothing to do with the pending amendment before us.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Operating expenses: For an additional amount for "Operating expenses," including the hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$35,000,000, of which \$30,000,000 shall be available only for the weapons program: *Provided*, That appropriations granted to the Commission under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available in amounts not to exceed \$25,064,275 for expenses of program direction and administration personnel, and not to exceed \$2,709,350 for expenses of travel.

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment," including the purchase (not to exceed an additional 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$1,450,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs provided in the contracts, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 13, line 5, after the word "cost", strike out the words "provided in the contracts" and insert the words "of not to exceed \$57,000,000."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to correct what to my mind is a rather improvident provision in the bill, a provision which in effect gives a blank check to the Atomic Energy Commission to incur cancella-

tion costs without limit in connection with its purchase of power under its proposed expansion program. Under its program, the Commission contemplates deriving power from three sources: The Tennessee Valley Authority at Oak Ridge; a private power group known as the E. E. I. at Paducah, Ky.; and another group of private-power interests which is now being organized to supply power to a new site in the Ohio Valley, which as of the present time has not been selected.

The Commission is now in the process of negotiating such contracts, and in view of the fact that the Commission will be the sole user of the power to be developed, those supplying the power demand assurance that in the event the contracts are terminated by the Commission, they will be protected against financial loss. The testimony given to our subcommittee shows that the maximum cancellation cost to TVA will be approximately \$28,000,000 plus, and the maximum cost to the E. E. I. group will be in the same amount. This is the \$57,000,000 provided by my amendment.

The Commission also requested an additional \$220,000,000 to be used either for construction of a generating plant in the event it could come to no agreement with the private group negotiating to furnish power to the new site, or in the alternative to be used for cancellation costs in the event it does reach such an agreement. The private group proposes to invest some \$400,000,000 to furnish power to the Commission. It seemed to me at the time of the hearings, as it does today, that an allowance of \$220,000,000 for possible cancellation costs on such an investment is unreasonable. I do not think that the Commission made a case justifying the appropriation of this sum for cancellation costs, because the terms of the deal are not yet known, its new site has not yet been selected, and the potential market in the area has not yet been determined. The amount of the estimate is in my opinion excessive, and yet the language of the bill would permit payment of an indefinite amount of cancellation costs, without limitation of any kind. It could be the \$220,000,000 maximum requested by the Commission, or for all we know, under the powers granted by this section of the bill, the entire amount of \$400,000,000 could be allocated toward cancellation costs, a procedure which would certainly be unwarranted and unjustifiable.

It is not my intention in anywise to retard the expansion program. I know how urgently it is needed, and I favor its progress at top speed, but the fact that we favor the expeditious completion of the atomic program does not mean that we must throw reason to the winds and provide unending funds for the purpose without exercising in measure, at least, some business judgment. The amendment I have offered will not hurt the new program, and it will give us a chance to follow the costs. It should be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have considered the amendment and the committee will accept it if there is no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, having consulted with my colleagues, there is no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM: On page 13, line 8, after "cost", strike out "Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project."

(Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to take the floor of the House here and oppose a great committee like that on appropriations, but this morning the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am acting chairman at the present time, met and passed unanimously a resolution that we oppose the proviso on page 13, beginning on line 8, and that is the reason I have offered an amendment to strike this proviso from the bill before the House. The joint committee, which has made a very intensive study of this program over the past 9 months, is fully aware of all the difficulties that we face. Some of these projects are entirely new. None have ever been built before and the time required for building them would be 4 or 5 years, so it becomes very difficult for the Commission to determine the exact end cost which this proviso requires. The over-all request by the President was \$3,200,000,000 and this measure before us carries less than one-half that amount. This is not so serious, in my opinion, if we could immediately start the whole program at one time. The committee is informed by people, I believe, who know the facts, that it will delay the completion of the over-all program. In this I am in agreement. That is why I am asking the House to take out this proviso. I know the gentleman from Texas, who is head of this subcommittee [Mr. THOMAS], and I are in agreement on some things that the Commission should do. I have personally introduced legislation over the past 4 or 5 years that would require the Commission to secure authorization from the joint committee, and I believe this is what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and other members of the Appropriations Committee would like.

It is true that many of the projects in the present program are duplications of what we have already built, and there is little reason why plans could not be prepared and estimates given that are fairly accurate, but the hydrogen program, we all realize, is entirely new, and there are many other things that are new and have never been built before.

I know that no member of the Appropriations Committee, or other Members of the House, desires in any way to delay the project which, in my opinion, is the

most important in our defense program. I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], whom I have high regard for, is just as patriotic as I or any other Member of the House.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, how will this possibly interfere with any legitimate operation of the Atomic Energy Commission? That is what I should like to have the gentleman discuss.

Mr. DURHAM. The fact is you cannot start this over-all program under this proviso, as I have stated before. The cut in appropriations is not so serious, but this proviso will delay the projects, and it would simply put the Commission in the position of not starting all of the program because no one can determine final cost on facilities never built before, and much of this program is new for hydrogen facilities.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid the gentleman has not read it.

Mr. DURHAM. I have tried to analyze it and the committee has also tried to analyze it as best we could in the short period of time, and we have come to the conclusion, as I have stated before, that it will delay the program. I trust the House will adopt my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as acting chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I feel it is my duty to place before the House, to the best of my ability, the facts concerning the atomic plant expansion program.

This program has its roots in studies and discussion that commenced more than a year ago. During the spring of 1951 it became apparent to members of the joint committee, the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, Commission personnel, and high officers of the Military Establishment, that we should consider the advisability of stepping up our national atomic effort.

On June 7, 1951, the joint committee wrote to the Commission and to the Defense Department requesting an estimate as to the cost of increasing, by various degrees and amounts, existing and planned atomic production capacity. About 3 months later, on August 31, the Commission furnished cost estimates covering each of the various degrees of expansion.

With this report in mind, on September 18, the joint committee chairman introduced in the Senate, and I introduced in the House, a concurrent resolution resolving that "the United States must go all-out in atomic development and production." In our resolution the chairman and I pointed out that "the cost of military firepower based upon atomic bombs is hundreds of times cheaper, dollar for dollar, than conventional explosives." We pointed out that the Nation's defense plans, as of that time, still assigned only 3 cents in the military dollar to these weapons. The resolution proposed in effect, an atomic army, an atomic navy and an atomic air force.

Later in September of last year the joint committee heard extensive and detailed testimony from the Secretary

of Defense, each of the Service Secretaries, and each of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Without exception these gentlemen declared, in strong terms, that they need many more atomic weapons for the defense of the United States. Most of this testimony was so secret that it did not lend itself to security censorship followed by publication. However, in one case—that of Secretary of the Navy Kimball—the testimony was capable of being published after security censorship, and according to the published version Mr. Kimball said this:

We think the atomic bomb family is and will remain our most potent weapon. * * * Generally I would think that of all of the services, we have needs for atomic bombs the same way as the Air Force have, and we have need for atomic bombs the same way as the Army has, but plus that we have some additional needs that neither of them have, so we cover all of the fields that they cover plus some additional fields.

An official joint committee statement, following the meeting with Secretary of the Army Pace on September 25, says this:

The witnesses commented upon Army programs designed to make tactical use of fissionable material, especially from the viewpoint of military effectiveness and methods of delivery. The Army attaches high significance to its work looking toward atomic energy exploitation on the field of battle in case of war.

Secretary Pace made plain that future Army tactical requirements for atomic materials will be very substantial in quantity and all fissionable material should be produced as soon as practicable.

An official joint committee statement, following the meeting with Secretary of the Air Force Finletter on September 26, says this:

Secretary Finletter expressed in strong terms his belief that it would be highly desirable in the best interests of the security of the United States that a major expansion of the atomic project be undertaken at once.

An official joint committee statement, following the meeting with Secretary of Defense Lovett and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on October 1, says this:

Mr. Lovett and the Joint Chiefs vigorously recommended a major expansion program.

It was while we were taking this testimony from the Defense Department that President Truman announced the second and third atomic bomb test explosions within the Soviet Union.

On October 17, 1951, the Joint Committee unanimously adopted a resolution calling upon the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense to submit to us a "definite and concrete report on maximizing the role which atomic energy can and should play in the defense of the United States." This report was to be submitted to the Joint Committee by January 3 of the present year.

On October 19, 1951, the Joint Chiefs of Staff established a formal atomic production requirement that foreshadowed the program which we are now considering in this House. In other words, what the Congress has been asked to appropriate through the supplemental budget request for atomic energy is an

implementation of what the Joint Chiefs of Staff laid down as a military requirement in October of last year. I cite the date—it was October 19, 1951—because more than 8 months have now elapsed.

Also on October 19 I addressed the House and stated my reasons “why I have supported and why I shall continue to support an all-out atomic program.” I said that “we can have as much uranium as we want, within limits, provided that we are willing to pay the cost,” and I added that “I have done my best to help dispel the illusion that supplies of uranium are a rigid and fixed quantity.” I also quoted an official statement by Mr. Gordon Dean, the Atomic Energy Commission Chairman, in which he said:

Every dollar of the American taxpayer's money that you spend on the atomic energy program, up to the tune of approximately \$5,000,000,000 additional in capital plant and equipment, with an allowance for approximately \$700,000,000 a year for operating that plant and equipment, over and above our present program, would be dollars very well spent.

On January 21, 1952, the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission made available the report requested through the unanimous resolution of the joint committee. This report strongly recommends a plant expansion on the scale which the House of Representatives is currently considering. The next day we were advised that the Atomic Energy Subcommittee of the National Security Council had unanimously approved and that the President himself had approved this expansion program and further that money to pay for it would very soon be requested of the Congress.

On January 23 the joint committee met with the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission. On February 6 we met with the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. With all these gentlemen and with the Atomic Energy Commissioners, the joint committee thoroughly reviewed and weighed the report we had received and the expansion program vigorously recommended in it. I think I speak for every committee member, Democrat and Republican alike, in saying that we all approved the substance of what was proposed, at least as a minimum.

Following this, Mr. Chairman, 5 months elapsed and nothing happened. Two and three times a week and sometimes every day or even twice a day, we made inquiries as to when the supplemental budget request would be sent up to the Congress. Almost invariably the reply was that the budget request would be received next week. But it did not actually arrive until May 29.

I mention these facts because the joint Atomic Energy Commission-Defense Department report prepared at the committee's request states on page 5 the following:

Schedules are based on an assumption of congressional authorization of expansion as of July 1, 1952. Earlier authorization to permit programming of requirements with mobilization agencies and placing of orders with suppliers would permit an acceleration of schedules.

On page 20, the report states:

Each month of earlier authorization before July 1, 1952, would save more than a month in the construction completion date, since suppliers of equipment for the presently authorized program could maintain current production lines in operation.

This official and momentous report, in other words, stresses that months count and that, in the interest of national security, the Congress should act speedily to approve the funds to be requested. Despite this emphasis upon the need for speed, 5 months were permitted to elapse before the appropriation request in question was actually transmitted.

I feel that the record should show that the delay up through May 29 of the present year is attributable to the absence of an appropriation request and that up and until May 29 the Congress has had no opportunity to act. There are documents in the joint committee files which show that, after 3 months had elapsed, the committee protested against the delay and asked that the appropriation request be submitted “in the immediate future.”

The supplemental budget request, when it arrived, asked for the Commission's use not quite \$3,200,000,000. Of this sum, about \$2,900,000,000 is for the plant expansion program, and the money is to be spent over a period of about 5 years. Approximately \$970,000,000 will be requested at a later date to expand plant, so that the total expansion cost to the Commission will be something under \$4,000,000,000 and the average annual cost will be something on the order of \$800,000,000. Outlays next fiscal year for this program will be about \$600,000,000. The supplemental budget now before us also asks about \$267,000,000 in other current requests apart from the expansion program.

There are several points that I would like to clarify for the record and for the consideration of this House. First of all, I have been flatly assured by the Atomic Energy Commission, in no uncertain terms, that we will indeed have the raw materials necessary to operate all the new plants.

Second, in general, the new program calls for expanding Hanford and expanding Oak Ridge—the two major installations started during the last war. The program likewise contemplates expanding Savannah River and Paducah—the two major installations started since the war. The program also calls for one major new site, as well as the necessary supporting facilities—some of which will also be located at new sites.

Third, I want to make clear that this is not an all-out program. It calls for doing about 50 percent of what our experts believe we are capable of doing—and the new plants are to go forward at perhaps 70 percent of the speed with which comparable plants were constructed during the Second World War.

The fact that we are undertaking this program, rather than a larger or smaller program, is strictly the responsibility of the military. It is they who have said, in written recommendations going back as far as October 19 of last year, that they need and must have what is now proposed. I desire to state most emphatically that, in my view, the fact that the military do not ask for all the Atomic Energy Commission is capable of giving them is their solemn decision, one for which they will, of course, be held accountable by the American people and by the judgment of history. It is now the equally solemn duty of the Congress to do its part in carrying out this decision for the defense of our country.

Although I regret the 5 months which elapsed between January and May 29, when the supplemental appropriation request was received, and although I regret that the Congress as a whole has not yet had even 1 month to consider this program, I also point out that the time consumed by the executive branch reflected an attempt to cut to a minimum the costs involved. In January the Commission believed that the expansion program would cost on the order of five billion or more. The Commission now believes that the cost will be less than four billion. In other words, through exhaustive study and planning, more than a billion dollars has been pared. The appropriation, I am convinced, cannot safely be cut further.

I therefore strongly urge the House to approve the money request as it was transmitted—and to approve it before we leave for the political conventions. The fact that the executive branch has been late in sending up the supplemental is all the more reason why the Congress should not delay this program further.

As is clear from the quotations in the official report which I read to you, it is exceedingly important that the money be available by July 1, the start of fiscal 1953. Let it not be said that Congress dragged its feet in building the irreducible minimum of atomic preparedness. This program is the very least the Nation can do. Let us therefore do our part quickly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a new provision. It has been in bills before and I hope it will be in bills in the future. Otherwise we have that situation which has been apparent in the past, in which an agency of Government, having been refused the amount of money it wanted, went right ahead and started a project upon some scale beyond the desires of Congress.

This wording was very carefully prepared. If the gentleman will read it carefully, he will see that it says that no part of the appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, or any utility, or any specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, or such utility, or other specific portion of the project. That was worded very carefully to meet the situation the gentleman from North Carolina fears.

It is desirable that the Atomic Energy Commission, like any agency of Government, come to the committee of the Congress charged with the responsibility for the spending of money and indicate as accurately as it can the amount of money needed. It can do that in almost every type of construction, administration buildings, cafeterias, roads, on down the line. It has the money, therefore, when it starts, to compete them.

When it comes to larger objectives, it has built similar plants in the past. The Atomic Energy Commission does not know the specific cost, and at times

it does not have the plans fully prepared, but it knows approximately what it costs. This subcommittee on which I serve has never been hesitant in giving money for any construction work for which the Atomic Energy Commission can give us any reasonable evidence of the need for that money.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], was quoted in the paper the other day on this same subject, as having said that the Atomic Energy Commission had a record of over-estimating its needs by 100 percent.

It is little by little getting a more accurate knowledge of what it needs and I think the gentleman from North Carolina need have no concern, if that is left in, that it will handicap the development of the entire project in which he is interested, and concerning which we also know the details. However, it must be left in if you are to prevent, as you should prevent, the general start of projects in this agency; and I hope in other agencies when we have not yet approved the construction and the appropriation of the money.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I will say that we on the Atomic Energy Committee have been concerned, and I think this Congress should give the green light to this program.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I said you were concerned about it.

Mr. PRICE. I think we should give the green light to the Atomic Energy program. The recommendations of the President were more or less the results of the efforts of our committee to force an expansion of this very important program.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We recognize that.

Mr. PRICE. I think this is the most important program in our defense effort. The President made his recommendations to Congress, I think, more or less as a result of the pressure put on him by our congressional committee, and we are deeply concerned because of the language in this bill, and we fear that instead of giving the green light, it is putting the red light in their way.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We think we have given them the green light.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Certainly there is no intention on the part of any member of our subcommittee to put any barrier in the way of the Atomic Energy Commission's program of expansion.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. What we tried to do was to provide sufficient funds to permit them to go forward with the construction of their expanded program on a reasonable basis without a limitation which would hamper them unduly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think it would help us if either of the gentlemen who are discussing this and who are on the Joint Committee would explain how this could prevent the commission or handicap the commission in getting the work going.

Mr. PRICE. I would say very simply that it would prevent the start of new work.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this chapter dealing with the Atomic Energy Commission close in 10 minutes, with the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important subject, and I would not object otherwise. But this is terrific, and I must object to such a short length of time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this chapter dealing with the Atomic Energy Commission close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the subcommittee chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, if the Members will take the bill at page 13 and read this proviso with me they will see exactly what the difficulty is:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation—

That is the current one—

shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

I hope the committee will give very careful attention to this, because a great deal of their future may depend upon it.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has initiated through its own processes a material expansion of the productive facilities of the Atomic Energy Commission in certain areas which we would enjoy very much discussing with you were this not such a public meeting. If this appropriation were for the entire amount that is required to complete this expansion program then of course the proviso would be perfectly O. K. But by this language AEC is limited to starting parts of the project that will cost a total of \$1,450,000,000 when that is only a part of the total program. If the AEC is to complete this program on time to meet the military needs of our country they must start the entire project almost simultaneously. They do not expect to expend the entire cost in 1 year. It will be over a period of years, but it must be started practically simultaneously, and this limitation will prevent them from starting but a fraction of the program.

I do not believe that the Appropriations Committee realizes what it is doing by this proviso. It will certainly stymie the production program which has been very carefully worked out for increasing the production of fissionable material, a thing which is vitally important to this country and the free world in the race in which we are engaged, as you know.

We hope that the committee itself will see fit to permit the deletion of this language without its going to a

vote. I assure you it is vitally important. I say that as a member of the joint committee which has been engaged on this program for some time. We were shocked to find the language as it is in the bill, quite frankly, and we do not believe that the Appropriations Committee has given full consideration to the needs and the urgency of this program. I urge the deletion of the proviso by the adoption of Mr. DURHAM's amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee which handled this appropriation, I would like to add briefly to the explanation already given by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. We cannot believe that these good Members who are doubtful about this language have quite understood the effect of it, because this provision was very carefully drawn. Of course we cannot discuss the details of these atomic problems, but your Committee on Independent Offices when faced with the request for a large amount of money for the expanded atomic energy program attempted to do two things: First, to grant a sufficient portion of the money at once so that the program would not be endangered or retarded a single day; second, to make sure that the program was safeguarded until they came before us again with more detailed estimates for the remainder of the funds.

This is only a supplemental bill. Presumably when the Congress reassembles next January there will be a further request from the Commission, and at that time presumably they will have worked out in greater detail their estimates. Certainly the appropriation will be completed when we come to the regular appropriation bill next year.

In order that their program should not be delayed, and at the same time that we may fully protect the interests of the taxpayers by keeping control of the program until the Commission had worked out its plans and estimates, this language was carefully drawn:

It does not say that they cannot start a project until they have all the money to complete it. In fact, they can start several projects if they wish to do so, but they must build unit by unit and not start one portion unless they have funds to carry it through. That means they can get going on the necessary drainage, the necessary sewerage, the necessary railroad sidings, highways and approaches, and everything else necessary so that no time will be lost from now until next January or such time as further action is taken.

This language "any portion of a project" is something quite new in this type of appropriation, and it was inserted for the purpose of safeguarding this program in order that they could start all the projects, all the program and go ahead, the only condition being that they could not start any portion of it unless they

were prepared to complete it, that portion, and certainly they could not complete any very large project even if they had all the money and there were no restrictions, before next January when this matter will be acted on again.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Was it not the gentleman's recollection, too, of the testimony before our subcommittee that the Commission representatives testified that they were sent back by the Senate to make a re-estimate of the amount of money they would need, and they came down approximately \$2,000,000,000 in the total?

Mr. COTTON. That is true. They were perfectly frank in telling us they did not have all their plans worked out. This limitation does not hurt them. It merely compels them to come back to us with definite plans and specifications before they obtain the remainder of the money. This language in the bill will not retard the program for 1 day, but it will prevent waste.

I hope the amendment proposed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will be rejected.

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] is recognized.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since the creation of that committee, I believe I am in position to know something about the importance of the comprehensive program of the Atomic Energy Commission to increase the production of atomic weapons. I am inclined to believe that the members of the subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations that drafted the proviso in question were not fully aware of what is contemplated in the expanded program.

This morning our committee met with the members of the Commission, and on a number of other occasions we have met with the Commission for the purpose of discussing this program.

We are satisfied that the Commission does not intend to start any projects that are unnecessary or which are not contemplated as a part of the expansion plan. Our committee is satisfied that the language contained in this proviso, instead of being a green light will definitely be a red light which will prevent or at least hamper the Commission from going ahead with the program to step up the production of atomic power.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman tell us in what respect this provision will prevent the Atomic Energy Commission from proceeding?

Mr. ELSTON. I think it will prevent them from proceeding, because the amendment definitely indicates that money must be available for a project before it can be proceeded with.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. In just a moment I will be glad to.

For example, some of the plants contemplated under the program will take years to build. Certainly the Commission does not want to start to build them until they are certain the funds are going to be available. The Commission feels, and I agree with it, that this amendment will greatly restrict its building of essential facilities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. If this amendment had been in existence as law when the Manhattan project was started, we would not have the atomic bomb now. In other words, as I understand this, if the Atomic Energy Commission has in mind a plant that it would take 3 to 5 year to build they cannot proceed until the Congress appropriates the full amount of money. My understanding is that the ordinary procedure is to appropriate from year to year, pretty much as the work can be done during that year.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct. The Commission cannot proceed with its plan to expand atomic production unless it has a green light to go ahead. The Commission agrees with the gentleman from Massachusetts, and every member of our committee, I feel, agrees with him, that this proviso will definitely retard the Commission in its effort to go ahead. This is in a supplemental appropriation bill and I see no harm whatever in eliminating the proviso. If the Appropriations Committee later on, when the Commission comes in and asks for the remainder of the funds, sees fit to put some limitation in the bill, that might not be objectionable, but for the present it certainly should be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio has made several good points. Particularly the last point was a very good one. Because this is highly questionable language and controversial it might be wise to take it out of this supplemental bill and reconsider the language.

I am certain that the subcommittee is favorable to expansion of the atomic-energy program. It is not the committee's intention in any way to delay that expansion program. We who are members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Members on both sides of the aisle, the Members on both sides of the Capitol, are unanimous in our feeling this is dangerous language and would hamper the expansion program. As a matter of fact, we have a feeling it may set the program back as much as 2 years.

I would like for the Members to bear in mind that we are actually talking about the so-called H-bomb program. This expansion program is pretty much the baby of the Congress itself because the joint committee has sponsored and

pushed this program and has urged the expansion of the program.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question because I think he feels this way about it. I wonder if he does not think that by the passage of this section of the bill pending here that the Congress has given its full approval to the expansion program on the urgent basis suggested by the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and if he does not think and feel it is necessary for the security of the Nation?

Mr. THOMAS. What is the direct question?

Mr. PRICE. The question is whether or not the gentleman's committee supports this expansion program fully?

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to my distinguished friend from Illinois that I have not the slightest hesitancy in making the statement that it is unanimous, 100 percent, in the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE. I was certain that was going to be the answer of the gentleman. I know that is the feeling of all the members of his subcommittee and I am certain it is the feeling of all the Members of the House that we want this expansion program. We who are on the Atomic Energy Committee feel honestly and sincerely that this language should be more carefully considered, that it would hamper the program.

I would like to read to the House a resolution adopted this morning by our joint committee, and I will say that it was adopted unanimously by Members of both parties and of both Houses. This resolution reads as follows:

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy met this morning and considered with the Atomic Energy Commission the proviso beginning on page 12, line 6, in the supplemental appropriations bill now pending before the House. It is clear that if this proviso becomes law, the Atomic Energy Commission will not be able to meet military requirements for atomic weapons as laid down by the President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The joint committee has unanimously requested that the House and Senate give consideration to deleting the proviso in question. In effect, as the proviso stands, the Commission cannot start on the programs necessary to meet military requirements, because the funds requested of the Congress were cut in half and because the proviso provides that no building project may be started unless funds are available to complete it.

The joint committee has studied this program over an extended period of time and believes that the rider will prevent this program from going forward as national security requires.

(Mr. PRICE and Mr. RANKIN asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we all must frankly say that there are no finer Members in this House than our distinguished friends, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. They are on the Committee on Armed Services and they are on the

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. So, we cannot lightly dismiss or discount what they say.

But, let us look at the facts. My good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], said that the Atomic energy program had been carefully worked out. Oh, my goodness, how I wish that were true. Let us look at the general picture first; just start in from scratch.

The present Commission and its staff and its predecessors have been working on this problem for 10 long years. They have an expansion program under way, but it will not be completed for from 24 to 30 months from now at a cost of no telling how much—two to three billion dollars. It is about a hundred percent expansion. And, they did not start with a single plan or specification. Du Pont is the contractor. Du Pont had to hire 2,500 architect engineers who drew plans one day for construction work, they were to undertake a day or so later. Now, that is putting it rather bluntly, but it gives a pretty good example of how they have operated. It is the most extravagant, it is the most expensive way in the world to operate. Talk about the committee having considered it, gentlemen. We have urged and we have pleaded with the Atomic Energy Commission for four long years to do a little advance planning and have some plans and specifications drawn. Why? Because it will save your taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, and we think it will save time, too.

Now here you are, and you are starting out on another 100 percent expansion program, building up one that is not even finished, and they come up with the idea that it is going to cost in round figures \$3,900,000,000 without any plans or specifications. All they know is that they are going to have 200 or 300 units, and by that we mean railroad lines, power plants, warehouses, offices, and so forth. And how long is it going to take?

They say we are not to mention that, but, of course, there will be 50,000 or 75,000 people in the neighborhood who will know how long it takes, and I do not know why this House should not have it—6 years. And yet they do not want to have any plans and specifications.

We made one mistake here. We did not put it into the law that they should come up with plans and specifications. If they do not know what they want now, after spending six or seven billion dollars and having been in the business for 6 years, building here and building there, they never will know, and you know that is true.

Look at the testimony of the General Contractors of America, and I respectfully refer you to the hearings on this point. If they do not know what they are talking about, certainly the Atomic Energy Commission does not know, because these people have a national office here in Washington. They have no ax to grind. They are not representing any one man or anybody. They are just representing the contractors as a whole. They say that you will not only save

many millions of dollars but you will save time, by doing what? By saying, "Go out here and get yourselves a set of architects and engineers and give them 6 months' advance planning."

Mr. Chairman, this language ought to stay in the bill. It will save you hundreds of millions of dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DURHAM) there were—ayes 29, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Office of the Administrator
Defense housing*

For an additional amount for "Defense housing", including not to exceed \$1,433,735 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in connection with construction of housing under such appropriation, \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds hereby appropriated shall not be available in excess of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for defense housing by title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for the construction of any project unless funds are available for the completion of such project.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDONOUGH: On page 14, line 18, after the period, insert the following: "No part of this appropriation may be used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public Housing Administration or for any other purposes so long as that agency proceeds with any public-housing project after such project has been rejected or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing body has recognized local liability to reimburse the Federal Government for funds, if any, advanced on such project prior to such cancellations."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill, and it introduces new subject matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes, briefly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which is restrictive as to the use of funds provided for in this bill. As I read the bill, there are similar restrictions in other clauses in the bill which limit the use of funds for specific purposes. Since this is of the same nature as the other restrictions, in my opinion, it is germane and I trust the Chairman will so find.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair has had opportunity to examine this amendment, and is of the opinion that it is merely a limitation upon the manner in which, and the purpose for which, the money can be used and therefore is germane and overrules the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with some of the gentlemen on the committee, and since the amendment is germane, the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I find here at the table no objection to the amendment, and we accept it here at the table also.

(Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask for this time is because I want the House to know exactly what it is doing on this particular amendment.

The amendment provides that no money can be spent of the Public Housing appropriation for administration or any other purpose in a project that has been rejected, or previous approval thereof guaranteed by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote. Now that sounds very reasonable, but here is the subject matter in dispute. What is the governing body of a locality in regard to this particular thing? Of course, this refers specifically to the Los Angeles situation where the public housing authority of the city was set up under the laws of the State of California, and proceeded to make certain contracts with the Federal Government. They spent \$13,000,000 of the Federal Government's money under this particular contract, a valid contract, and so held by the California supreme court. If the governing body of the locality refers to the city council of Los Angeles, you have a conflict there because the city council of Los Angeles has recently voted not to continue this contract. But the power to contract and the power to negotiate with the Federal Government is not in the city council of Los Angeles, but in the city housing authority set up under the laws of the State of California. Therefore, you have a conflict as to who is the governing body and this is the subject of litigation at the present time. If the governing body of the locality refers to the city council, you are, in effect, taking sides in a suit which is before the court. If it refers to the city housing authority set up under the laws of the State, then that is another matter. It is directed at a situation which is in litigation at the present time between the city housing authority and the city of Los Angeles. It has to do with contracts entered into in good faith by both

the Federal Government and the city housing authority.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. We have thought about this matter a great deal in the subcommittee. We carried a similar limitation in the regular bill. It is not the purpose, as the gentleman pointed out, for the subcommittee or even the Congress of the United States, I am sure, to get mixed up in anybody's local fight.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, that is exactly what you are doing. That is what the amendment does, in my opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman permit me to make a statement?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. THOMAS. Now the limitation on the use of Federal funds.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. I am aware of that.

Mr. THOMAS. When we go to conference and have an opportunity to study the thing, if it develops after study that the limitation will prevent the Federal Government from protecting itself through recovery of funds that it has already invested not only in the project that you mention, but others of course, we are going to do our best to take it out of the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course I recognize the gentleman's persuasive powers in making his statement to the House, that if the matter becomes embarrassing in conference it will be taken out, but the gentleman also said he studied this amendment before in committee.

Mr. THOMAS. No. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I stated the committee had studied the subject. We had a similar one.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; but this is retroactive, and it has to do with an attempt to nullify a contract which was entered into in good faith and has been declared valid by the Supreme Court of the State of California between the city housing authority and the Federal Government. \$13,000,000 is at stake. The City Council of Los Angeles has never offered to pay the Federal Government the \$13,000,000 Federal funds which it spent. So there is at least that much at stake. Until the Los Angeles City Council comes into court with clean hands and offers to refund to the Federal Government the \$13,000,000 of Federal money which it has spent, the Congress has no right to come in and nullify a contract which is now being fought over in the courts. If the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] amendment provides for complete reimbursement of Federal expenditures, then I could not oppose it.

I am in favor of discharging contractual obligations in an honorable manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I think we are ready to vote upon this amendment, but rather than leave the record with a statement that might be misunderstood, I would like to read two statements.

First, the City Council of Los Angeles on the 5th of May this year, by a vote of 11 to 4, adopted a resolution, the following two sentences of which were:

1. That if the majority of the people vote "yes" in favor of the 10,000 units of public housing, the program will go forward as planned.

2. But if the majority of the people vote "no," this will be accepted as a mandate to abandon the program and an expression of the willingness of the majority of the people that the city assume the damages subsequent to this action.

That means to repay approximately \$12,000,000 involved in this.

There is no question but that the city would have to pay back the money. The reason this amendment becomes necessary is contained in an opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of California in a recent decision, No. 22211, if anybody is interested, on page 26 of the decision, and I quote:

If it be desirable to include provisions for cancellation by city action, as distinguished from withholding of city approval prior to initiation, the subject is one to be addressed to the respective Federal and State legislative bodies for appropriate permissible enactments which would protect the rights of all interested parties.

The State legislature meets in August. They may take action then. This is our opportunity to take action on the Federal level. The actual question is whether we shall get back from the city of Los Angeles the \$12,000,000, or whether we shall force upon them, against a vote of over 100,000 majority, \$97,000,000 more of Federal money which is desired in other areas of the country and not desired here.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the amendment offered by the gentleman from California protect, in the gentleman's opinion, the investment of the Federal Government to date?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. That is clear. Page 323 and subsequent pages of the hearings clear that up.

Mr. YATES. Does it apply to California alone?

Mr. PHILLIPS. As far as I know.

Mr. McDONOUGH. No, it does not.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think it would be applied anywhere if the people do not want public housing.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am advised by the Speaker and the majority leader that while it is their hope we can finish this bill this afternoon, that if we do not, it will have to be finished tomorrow. With that thought in mind I ask unanimous consent that all debate on chapter VII of this bill end in 5 minutes; there is nothing controversial about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I have too much respect for the members of this great House Appropriations Committee on both sides of the aisle to take the time for an explanation of what my amendment would do when I found that both the majority and minority leadership of this committee would not oppose it and agreed to accept my amendment; but since my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has taken time to explain his side of the question, I think you are entitled to hear a little of the other side also.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not specifically directed at the public housing controversy that exists in Los Angeles; although it will do a great deal to clarify and help to settle that controversy. The people of Los Angeles, by a vote of 379,050 "no" to 258,777 "yes," or a majority of 120,273, voted "no" to public housing on June 3. This amendment will protect any number of cities in the United States, the list of which follows that have voted "no" on public housing:

Results when citizens are given opportunity to vote on subsidized public housing— Defeats of Government housing through referenda (rejection of programs under Housing Act of 1949)

City	Date	Against Public Housing	For Public Housing
Grand Rapids, Mich.	July 20, 1949	10,678	6,874
St. Petersburg, Fla.	Nov. 18, 1949	3,876	3,300
Seattle, Wash.	Mar. 14, 1950	57,732	33,529
Yakima, Wash.	Mar. 14, 1950	7,377	1,216
Lubbock, Tex.	Apr. 4, 1950	4,045	3,944
Racine, Wis.	Apr. 4, 1950	12,312	2,839
Rapid City, S. Dak.	Apr. 18, 1950	1,707	1,390
South Haven, Mich.	Apr. 25, 1950	613	603
Astoria, Oreg.	May 19, 1950	2,274	1,557
Portland, Oreg.	May 19, 1950	62,478	53,327
San Luis Obispo, Calif.	June 6, 1950	2,869	2,831
La Crosse, Wis.	June 6, 1950	3,021	2,807
Raymondville, Tex.	July 15, 1950	535	154
Houston, Tex.	July 22, 1950	35,141	22,060
Pine Bluff, Ark.	Aug. 29, 1950	1,165	1,061
Flint, Mich.	Sept. 12, 1950	16,937	10,596
Tucson, Ariz.	Sept. 26, 1950	6,403	1,213
Madison, Wis.	Nov. 7, 1950	16,064	13,480
Kenosha, Wis.	Nov. 7, 1950	12,294	10,631
Lane County, Oreg.	Nov. 7, 1950	22,196	11,018
Edinburg, Tex.	Nov. 14, 1950	(1)	(1)
Roanoke, Va. (advisory referendum—not binding)	Jan. 9, 1951	5,009	1,892
Dillon, S. C.	Mar. 13, 1951	436	391
Tyler, Tex.	Apr. 3, 1951	1,919	649
Milwaukee, Wis.	Apr. 3, 1951	(2)	—
St. Joseph, Mo.	Aug. 21, 1951	9,288	4,987
Jamestown, N. Y.	Sept. 29, 1951	2,176	1,909
East Orange, N. J.	Nov. 6, 1951	7,141	5,644
Clifton, N. J.	Nov. 1951	8,828	2,475
Bristol, Conn.	Nov. 26, 1951	3,017	1,772
Southington, Conn.	Nov. 26, 1951	71	42
Belton, Tex.	Dec. 4, 1951	(1)	(1)
Akron, Ohio	May 7, 1952	43,009	21,152
Decatur, Ill.	May 1952	8,813	4,858
Columbia, Mo.	May 6, 1952	(2 to 1)	—
Patterson, Calif.	May 1952	139	100
Hughson, Calif.	May 1952	228	126
Hillsboro, Tenn.	June 3, 1952	652	208
Los Angeles, Calif.	June 3, 1952	387,343	258,718

¹ Data on vote not available.

² Margin of 1,588 votes.

My amendment does guarantee that the local government is obligated to reimburse the Federal Government for the total amount of money spent on public housing projects up to the time when a contract is canceled or rejected.

The attitude of the Public Housing Administrator, Mr. Raymond Foley, on the public housing controversy in Los Angeles is clearly revealed in his testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee recently, when I had an opportunity to question him on that subject. Let me read to you my questions and Mr. Foley's answers:

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS BEFORE THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON S. 3066 ON JUNE 23, 1952, IN WHICH CONGRESSMAN McDONOUGH QUESTIONS RAYMOND M. FOLEY, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATOR, ON THE CONTROVERSIAL LOS ANGELES PUBLIC HOUSING ISSUE AND MR. FOLEY'S REPLIES INDICATING THE POSITION OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION ON THIS ISSUE

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDONOUGH—

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Foley, I presume that you are familiar with the situation so far as the public housing controversy is concerned that has been raging in Los Angeles for some time?

Mr. FOLEY. I think I am familiar with what has occurred up until very recent date.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The most recent action was a proposition on the ballot in which the people voted by a majority of more than 120,000 in effect to cancel the existing contract between the Federal Government and the Los Angeles Public Housing Authority and to declare that they did not want to proceed with the program now in effect. The question I would like to ask you, Mr. Foley, is this. If you were assured as Public Housing Administrator that all of the funds spent up to date by the Los Angeles Public Housing Authority would be reimbursed to the Federal Government, would you be willing to cancel the existing contract or cooperative agreement or the commitments that now exist between the Federal Public Housing Administration and the Los Angeles Public Housing Administration?

Mr. FOLEY. We have a very definite position on that, Congressman, if I may make a very brief statement on it. First, since it is a complicated legal question, I will ask our general counsel to state it to you for us, as he stated it within the past few days to another committee of the House.

There seems to be an impression prevailing in some quarters, I think an impression being manufactured in some quarters, that the housing agency is necessary and that Los Angeles go forward with the public housing program under discussion.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is, the Federal housing agency?

Mr. FOLEY. The Federal agency. That is not the case. We have a situation here where we have a contract entered into, with all of the requirements of law, and there are some very specific requirements in the act of 1949, of actions that must be taken by a community government as distinguished from the local authority with whom we enter into a contract through the Public Housing Administration. All of those have been complied with. The contract is entirely in accordance with law.

We have taken the position that we cannot unilaterally abrogate a contract, and have taken the position that a large amount of public funds, some \$12,678,000, which is, I think, the exact figure, has already been advanced; and without the request on the part of the other party of the contract, and the tender of the funds, we are not in a position to cancel the contract. Up to this time, to the best of our knowledge, neither of those conditions has been met.

Now I would like to ask Mr. Fitzpatrick to state a little more fully because I think it is an extremely important matter to this committee what is our position on it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Congressman, our problem arises out of the fact that our contract runs to the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles. Under the decision of the Supreme Court, particularly the decision in the Lynch case, the Court held specifically that rights arising out of a contract with the United States are protected by the due-process clause of the fifth amendment—that if the Federal Government has the power to enter into a contract, and does enter into it, the contract may not be abrogated unilaterally.

If the Los Angeles Authority comes to us and pays off the obligation under the contract, we have to terminate it. But the other party has to come to us and pay off and get the cancellation. We cannot ourselves simply cut off. I have suggested that remedy—

Mr. McDONOUGH. Let me interrupt you at that point. I understand that you cannot cut off because that would be unilateral action. You can, however, accede to the request of the Los Angeles Public Housing Authority to cancel the contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes; provided they pay us back.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Provided the Federal Government is reimbursed for all losses up to that point.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Do you feel as a Federal agency that since the people have so expressed themselves, that there is public sentiment that is not favorable and therefore the security of the public housing project would not be as firm in Los Angeles as it would be if this vote had not been expressed and therefore there is danger of continuing the controversy?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Certainly there is danger of continuing the controversy quite apart from any question about security. I think the basic and controlling intent of the Housing Act of 1949 was that the initiative for local housing plans rest with the community and with the people of the community that if they do not desire to take advantage of those programs which the Congress has authorized, it is not for the Federal Government to impose any such program upon them. It rests entirely on their decision.

If I may answer you further, I have this suggestion which I have made to Congressman PHILLIPS and I also discussed it with Senator NIXON, and that is that these are two agencies that are involved in a local row. They are in fact political subdivisions of the State of California. They are governed by the laws of California and were both created by the Legislature of the State of California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. When you say both, what do you mean?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I mean both the city of Los Angeles and the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles. I think the situation may be dealt with properly by the Legislature of the State of California which in such case may well say in terms of the law, when a situation occurs such as has occurred in Los Angeles, through the commissioner of the Los Angeles Housing Authority or any other housing authority that they are under a mandatory duty to go with your city council to the Federal Government and pay back the money and get out. That can be done appropriately by State law, since both are creatures of the legislature and subject entirely to its control.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate your reply very much, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and yours, Mr. Foley. In other words, you are stating that there is no effort being made on the part of the Federal Housing Administrator or the Commissioners to pursue the contract in Los Angeles in view of the expressed vote of the people in this primary election?

Mr. FOLEY. That is correct, even to the point of trying to keep from having further involvement as far as possible, through the letting out of funds, until it is settled, with one reservation; we have to point out that where the local authority has actually entered into a contract with others for the construction, or what have you, that we are not in a position to say to them, "You cannot proceed with those." In other words, we cannot order them to abrogate their contracts with someone else.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And I am further assured that you are willing to acquiesce providing the reimbursement is made?

Mr. FOLEY. Provided those conditions are met; yes, sir.

I thought it was necessary to bring this to your attention because my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has taken the floor to speak his piece, and I believe that this side of the controversy should be heard.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that the city attorney of Los Angeles has said that the city council does not have the money to pay this back? And is it not also true that they have not agreed to accept liability for the money that has been spent?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I do not believe that is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe it is.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Just a minute; I do not yield further. In the first place, the city attorney has no authority to tell the city council that it has or has not funds for such purposes. The city attorney's job is to advise the Los Angeles City Council on legal matters, not on financial matters.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. He rendered an opinion at the request of the city council.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I think in order to clarify the point—I assume it was listened to when the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] read it—the resolution of the city council states—nothing can be clearer:

If the majority of the people vote no—

This is on the public-housing question—

this will be accepted as a mandate to abandon the program, and the expression of the willingness of the majority of the people that the city assume the damages subsequent to that action.

Nothing can be clearer than that as an expression of the intent of the people of Los Angeles.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I urge the adoption of my amendment, not only because it will help to clarify the Los Angeles public-housing controversy but also because it will give positive assurance to all the other cities that have voted against public housing that they will not be burdened or influenced by the Federal Public Housing Administration to proceed with public housing against the will of the people.

(Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague from California has misunderstood the amendment as offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH], because it does not cancel any liability of the city of Los Angeles. It merely prevents public housing from being crammed down the throats of those communities which do not want it. The amendment provides that there shall be a settlement.

As to the statement that the city council is not the governing body in this subject matter of housing, let me say that my colleague certainly does not advocate that the voice of the people be not taken into consideration.

The housing authority was created by the State legislature and can be dissolved by that body, and if the Authority takes the attitude that they are the "Almighty," then I would certainly recommend that the State legislature dissolve them, which it is likely to do if they continue such dictatorial tactics.

However, I am sure my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], will agree that the will of the people should rule, and in Los Angeles with a large percentage of the majority of the registered voters voting, a majority of that vote, in excess of 120,000 voters, voted to cancel the contract and pay the damages. Yes, we are suggesting that this be handled by the democratic processes and according to the will of the people, and that any damages to the Federal Government be settled satisfactorily.

I might state further that yesterday this House rejected the conference committee report because of the number of houses to be built under this public-housing program, and in favor of the 5,000, instead of the 35,000. So if the program of the housing authority has been curtailed from 75,000 to 5,000, surely they do not want to cram down the throats of the citizens of Los Angeles a program which they are opposed to, when they do not have enough houses for areas where they want public housing.

Therefore, I think the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has very ably stated how this matter can be satisfactorily handled.

I would like to say to the gentleman that it is very surprising to me that various people who get up and oppose this amendment are the ones who are always saying that we should exercise the will of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it appropriate at this time to offer an amendment to section 7?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, the gentleman may offer an amendment to any portion; however, there is an amendment pending.

Mr. COUDERT. Then is it clear I may offer that amendment when the pending amendment has been disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. That may be done. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

[Mr. JACKSON of California addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the balance of section 7 will be considered as having been read.

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 16, line 1, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert "\$85,000,000."

(Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce by \$65,000,000 the appropriation herein carried for TVA to increase its power delivery for this new atomic-energy program. Private companies representing over a billion dollars in capital have offered to produce the power and they have offered to produce it without expense to the United States.

It is a clear-cut issue as to whether the House is going to deliberately further extend at public expense the TVA empire or take this offer of responsible, competent, private industrial power producers that will supply all the power needed for the Paducah plant in connection with this atomic-energy production. Members from States outside the Tennessee Valley area would do very well to vote for this in order to protect their own industries, to save the taxpayers this \$65,000,000 plus a second \$65,000,000 which would be the cost of the second half of the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, this money is put in here for one specific purpose. It is to implement the atomic energy program. Without this money your atomic energy program is not worth anything. You need it. They testified that it is going to cost \$305,000,000 to do the job, so we gave them \$150,000,000, knowing we were going to have to come up with another \$155,000,000. I do not think it would serve any useful purpose to cut it, because we are going to have to spend the money.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Is there not a valid and binding offer from six great utility

companies to perform the precise services that TVA has offered?

Mr. THOMAS. No. I do not understand it that way. I understand they could produce only a very small part of it.

Mr. COUDERT. They have bid and offered to produce 100 percent for the Paducah plant, and it is in the RECORD.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. All of this is needed for the atomic energy plant and the power is not available from any other source except the TVA.

Mr. THOMAS. That is my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 95, noes 77.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. COUDERT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 100, noes, 73.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Military construction

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), and the act of —, 1952 (Public Law —, H. R. 8120, 82d Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$5,000,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said act of September 28, 1951; \$600,090,000, to remain available until expended.

[Mr. McCORMACK addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHORT: On page 17, line 8, after the period, insert "of total amount appropriated in this paragraph, \$1,980,000 shall be allocated for Camp Crowder, Mo."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered does not increase by one thin dime the total appropriation for military construction in the Department of the Army.

In August 1941, before Pearl Harbor, Camp Crowder opened and operated all during World War II as a central Signal Corps school, and Army service forces training center. They trained more than 300,000 men in that particular camp. The original investment was approximately \$40,000,000, with a maximum capacity of troops of 42,000, but at one time it was overcrowded to 90,000 troops. Two thousand four hundred

civilian employees were also there. There was a medical detachment and also 1,000 WAC trainees.

The hospital area at that place was designed for 1,816 beds. More than 100,000 troops were hospitalized during the war years. In 1947, a year and a half following VJ day, Camp Crowder was discontinued, and approximately 30,000 of the 42,000 acres were disposed of. Some of the buildings were sold. Others were given away. Some were used for grain storage and poultry raising. But with the outbreak of the Korean conflict Camp Crowder was, shortly after the outbreak of the conflict, reactivated, and the Army already has spent approximately \$1,000,000 in construction and in refurbishing and renovating the barracks there. They contemplate spending another \$1,400,000, or more than \$2,000,000 altogether.

At the present time there are in Camp Crowder 12,619 acres. Included in this reservation, the current value of which is estimated at more than \$19,000,000 by GSA, which transferred it back to the Army, are 608 buildings, 24 easements water pumping plants and mains, fire system and telephone network, railroad trackage, and electric and gas distribution systems, and a sanitary sewer system. The estimated cost to replace the existing facilities at Camp Crowder is in excess of \$27,000,000.

The Congress has wisely gone on record, and I want to congratulate the members of the Appropriations Committee, especially the subcommittee, on insisting that we get maximum utilization out of existing facilities. Here we have more than 12,000 acres in a camp worth approximately \$19,000,000 or \$27,000,000 if we had to replace it, which is being used as an induction or reception center and also a separation center.

I visited this camp a month ago. I was told that we have approximately 100 officers at Camp Crowder, 500 enlisted men, 500 civilian employees, and there is an average flow of inductees or draftees of 2,500 to 3,000 per month, and an outflow of men returning from Korea and from abroad about to be separated of somewhere between 1,200 and 1,500 men a month.

Our Committee on Armed Services in the House, by unanimous vote, on recommendation of the Army itself, included Camp Crowder as a permanent troop and troop-support facilities center, and authorized \$1,980,000 for the purpose of further rehabilitating this center that is going to serve the Fifth Army Area, of perhaps 8 or 10 States in the Middle West. The only reason that the estimate was not requested of the subcommittee was because it was submitted late. They did not have time to go through all the red tape and details, but I feel confident that the Army itself would have no objection to the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(On request of Mr. RIVERS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SHORT was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman will recall that when our committee went into this matter we went into it exhaustively. We had the Army come up and give us this information which we were not able to get in the regular request. We found it would be highly economical that this be included in this program. It was a unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. SHORT. It was the unanimous report of the committee acting upon the recommendation of the Army itself.

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. And that is the fact I would like to impress upon the members of the subcommittee. It is due more or less to a technical error, or position, or the lack of time that the Army did not appear.

Mr. RIVERS. And it serves the entire area in which it is located.

Mr. SHORT. The whole Fifth Army Area of 10 or a dozen States in the Midwest with headquarters in Chicago.

I hope the subcommittee can see its way clear to adopt this amendment which will not increase \$1 or dime the total appropriation.

[Mr. RILEY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 74, noes 65.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RILEY and Mr. SHORT.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 102, noes 35.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to return to the colloquy of this morning between my very good and able friends, Representative FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, and Representatives SMITH of Wisconsin, and O'HARA, from Minnesota, and JACKSON of California, on the foreign policy in Korea.

It is my opinion that the resignation of Dean Acheson is long overdue.

There is a need for new leadership. Today we are assailed by doubts and insecurity. Even in the darkest days of the American Revolution the people never lost faith in the outcome, but today we are experiencing fear for our national security. This fear has been created to intimidate our people.

On the international scene we have been outbargained, outsmarted, out-

maneuvered. We have undergone humiliations unparalleled in our history.

The art of statecraft is rapidly vanishing. Particularly in the field of foreign policy and national defense. We have an administration operating under the appeasement policy. Every time a breeze wafts from the Kremlin, our leaders in Washington tremble anew, seeking a peace that is impossible to obtain while their blunders continue. They advocate appeasement and more appeasement. While they appease, the Soviet Union grows stronger in armaments and prestige.

For 20 years, starting with the recognition of Russia in 1933, our Government's official policy has been to appease Russia, and up until our troops were sent into Korea we let them have no more than a polite slap on the wrist.

Permit me to say the peak of confusion in the foreign policy field was reached with the decision to enter the war in Korea. This lightning decision which it is stated has cost us about 110,000 battle casualties—plus thousands of nonbattle casualties, is one of the most mystifying occurrences in our history. The Senate, after months of investigation was unable to discover what prompted the decision.

However, if I recall correctly, in 1949 the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, considered a budget of some \$17,000,000,000 for the national-defense program previous to the Korean war. But the administration suddenly became economy-minded. My very good and able friend, whom I greatly admired, the late Secretary of Defense James Forrestal, was replaced by Louis E. Johnson. The national-defense budget was cutback from \$17,000,000,000 to around \$13,500,000,000. The 70-group Air Force was reduced to 48; they mothballed the fleet; they canceled the carrier; Admiral Denfeld was fired. They cutback the Navy Air; cutback the ground forces; and cutback the Marine Corps.

Now, the American people were for effecting economies in all Government activities for other than defense activities; but the administration was economy-minded in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Then suddenly somebody conceived the idea—even though we had come 60,000 troops in Korea at one time which were gradually reduced to 4,000—in June 1949 to pull our troops out of Korea as it was considered outside of our perimeter of defense with the result that Stalin decided to move in. So, when he reached the decision to move in we reached the decision to fight our way back in, which we did at a tremendous cost of lives. We were sending our American youths into Korea to fight tanks with carbines—totally unprepared.

Now, throughout American history we have gone to war with only one purpose—to win. However, restrictions were imposed on our fighting men in Korea that made a clear-cut victory immeasurably difficult. These restrictions were imposed in the name of appeasing the Chinese Reds, even though those Reds were killing American men at every opportunity. For instance, our fliers

were forbidden to bomb the important North Korean supply center of Raskin in the early days of the war, supposedly because it was close to the Chinese border. However, in August 1951, the administration changed its mind and granted permission. In the meantime, innumerable American casualties undoubtedly could have been prevented.

General MacArthur wanted peace in Asia, but he wanted peace on our terms—not on those of the Kremlin. General MacArthur wanted a peace that would stick, a peace that would restore the prestige of America, a peace that would bring new hope to the hundreds of millions of Europeans and Asiatics who have been enslaved by the Communist regimes. For his efforts, MacArthur was fired. He was not even accorded the courtesy of a direct message from Washington to that effect. He heard the news via a news broadcast after the hurriedly called midnight press conference at the White House.

How much longer can America survive the State Department's policy of retreat and defeat? How then can the State Department ever exert the kind of moral and spiritual leadership that the rest of the world is crying for?

We are a mighty and humane Nation. We are too mighty for appeasement. We are too humane to support a senseless drain of blood in an endless treadmill war.

Time is not on our side. Time is a full partner in the Communist conspiracy. Only by full employment of strength, courage, and incisive leadership can the world Communist conspiracy be repelled and eventually defeated. It is only by adopting this principle that we can avert a third world war.

We must forge new weapons and new techniques to beat the threat of communism without resort to war. Our counterpropaganda is weak, unimaginative, and without appeal to the oppressed peoples of the world. We must devise new methods and new techniques.

We need new leadership in the State Department, and with new leadership, there will be new hope, a new spirit, and new confidence throughout the anti-Communist world.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Acquisition and construction of real property

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the act of March 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 17), the act of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 936) as amended, the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), and the act of —, 1952 (Public Law, —, H. R. 8120, 82d Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; not to exceed \$52,620,000 for planning (including advance planning, master planning, and investigational engineering) as authorized by section 504 of said act of September 28, 1951; and hire a passenger

motor vehicle; \$1,200,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be expended for actual construction of facilities or structures at Grandview Air Terminal, Mo., until the city of Kansas City, Mo., has conveyed to the United States Government the fee simple title to all lands required for the base or has given the United States Government at least a 25-year lease to such land on a nominal rental basis: *Provided further*, That no part of these funds shall be expended (except for planning) in connection with the proposed Strategic Air Command installation at Lincoln Municipal Airport, Lincoln, Nebr.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SIKES addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I direct my attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on Military Affairs with reference to my colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin with reference to Korea earlier today. Last week over the air waves, and in the press of America, somber and sad recognition was given to the second anniversary of the Korean war. Mr. Chairman, I hold no brief for the fateful policy or the deeds that have taken place which have put us in Korea—the fact remains that we are there—but as we look at the second anniversary of the war in Korea, it should tend to sharpen and place in clearer perspective America's tradition for liberty and independence. Liberty and independence, Mr. Chairman, we know, but we have a tendency to forget, imposes very high and very heavy responsibilities on the spirit as well as the body. As the Fourth of July, in this year of our Lord, approaches, every citizen of the United States of America can reexamine with pride the spirit and independence of this Nation because when we reexamine and realize the basic reasons why we are in Korea every man in this country and every woman can be prouder than ever before that he is an American citizen.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska: On page 19, lines 10 to 13, strike out "*Provided further*, That no part of these funds shall be expended (except for planning) in connection with the proposed Strategic Air Command installation at Lincoln Municipal Airport, Lincoln, Nebr."

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, since the hearings were held and the hearings were published, and this bill was printed, further hearings were conducted on this item. Yesterday, beginning at 2 o'clock and running past 5 o'clock, the subcommittee went into this matter. I understand that they are in accord on this amendment, and that it has been taken up with both sides. I

yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska is eminently correct. On yesterday, after the bill was marked up, the committee held further hearings on this Lincoln Airport.

One of the situations that has arisen is that we are asking three and a half million to move a naval unit out of the Lincoln Area Base to another location. This has been worked out so that the naval unit is going to remain and use the base facilities. In view of the further hearings and in view of the fine cooperation which has been extended the military service by the citizens of Lincoln who have invested some million dollars in an effort to build up housing for the troops, who have canceled leases and who have otherwise provided for funds to cooperate with the military, the committee will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has discussed with the committee a project in Athens, Ga., wherein certain existing buildings which are not being used will be used in connection with the Navy training program. However, the committee did not have sufficient time to get all the details necessary to include it in the measure at this time. I think it is sound, and I think the funds should be provided, but we needed certain basic information before we could request the Congress to approve these funds.

I did not want the RECORD to leave the impression that the committee would want the Navy to suspend plans which are being made to utilize this facility at Athens, Ga.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I understand there is no pending amendment with reference to this, but the House Armed Services Committee considered the matter carefully and did approve it for the authorization bill, and approved it on the basis that the State of Georgia was giving in use or in fee a very large facility there with fine buildings on it, worth five or six million dollars, for utilization by the military services. It seemed to me to be a very fine thing economically for the United States Government.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct. Except for the fact that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] had presented this matter to the committee, it would have been impossible that any progress could be made. While we did not have time to fully go into the matter, we have started the

wheels moving and it can be worked out in accordance with the desire of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown]. I would be pleased if the matter could be clarified and the funds included when this bill goes before the other body.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Of course, they need money to repair some of the buildings. They were supposed to start this fall. It has been leased for 10 or 20 years with an option to buy within 3 years. Unless they can get the money to repair some of the buildings I am afraid they cannot operate as early as they should.

Mr. MAHON. In view of the fact that the gentleman has called this to the attention of the committee, and as a result of his efforts we have started the wheels moving in the Navy, and I am hopeful it may be possible to get sufficient information to the Senate in time to include the necessary funds in this bill in its final form.

[Mr. HARDY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1705) to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for two United States commissioners for Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 631 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "Great Smoky Mountains" and by inserting after the second paragraph of such section the following new paragraph:

"Two United States commissioners may be appointed for Great Smoky Mountains National Park. One, whose jurisdiction shall be limited to the portion of the park situated in Tennessee, shall be appointed by the district court for the eastern district of Tennessee; the other, whose jurisdiction shall be limited to the portion of the park situated in North Carolina, shall be appointed by the district court for the western district of North Carolina."

Sec. 2. The jurisdiction of the United States commissioner holding office as commissioner of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park on the date of enactment of this act shall be limited to the portion of the park situated in North Carolina.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COPYRIGHTS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. BRYSON, RAMSAY, and CRUMPACKER.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 5678) entitled "An act to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and passed by the House of Representatives on reconsideration of the same, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

AMENDING THE ACT OF JULY 1, 1947

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 418) to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242), with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Lines 6 and 7, strike out "and by striking out 'District of Columbia' and inserting 'District of Columbia or immediate vicinity.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was thought we would change the law to provide for the Marine Corps Memorial to be erected in the District of Columbia or vicinity, because they found that they could best place it on Columbia Island. The Corporation Counsel has now decided that Columbia Island is within the District, so the language is unnecessary and the Senate has properly stricken it from the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JOHN McLOUGHLIN AND THE REVEREND JASON LEE

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) accepting the statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee from the State of Oregon for placement in the Capitol.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it necessary to have legislative action for a State to present a statue?

Mr. REGAN. In this instance Oregon, for the first time, has presented a statue to Congress for Statuary Hall. It was passed by the Senate in May.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They have none there now?

Mr. REGAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee, presented by the State of Oregon, one to be placed in Statuary Hall, are accepted in the name of the United States, and the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statues of two of its most eminent citizens, Dr. McLoughlin, illustrious as a great humanitarian, and first to govern the Oregon country, who often is called the "Father of Oregon"; and Reverend Lee, illustrious as the first missionary and colonizer in the Oregon country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Oregon.

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JOHN McLOUGHLIN AND REV. JASON LEE

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) authorizing temporary placement in the rotunda of the Capitol of the statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee, of Oregon, and the holding of ceremonies.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Oregon Statuary Committee is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statues of the late Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee, of Oregon, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That one statue shall be permanently located in Statuary Hall.

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 166 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and JOURNAL be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DR. ALEXANDER SYMEONIDIS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3600) for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the laws relating to immigration and naturalization, Dr. Alexander Symeonidis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 25, 1947, the date of his first entry into the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE PROVISIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT OF 1951

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of the bill (H. R. 7397) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what the date of termination will be under this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. March 31, 1953.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Has the Senate passed this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. The bill has been reported out of committee, but the Senate has not passed it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There was an understanding on the part of some members of the committee that this bill was to conform with the Federal law as to its termination date. Of course we do not know what the Federal law will be. I am wondering whether the Senate would accept an amendment so that it would conform to the Federal law.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is my understanding that it will.

The House District Committee considered the bill in committee yesterday and reported the bill with an amendment which would strike June 30, 1953, and insert March 31, 1953. The purpose in this amendment would be to make the District rent control conform to the Federal rent act. The committee wrote this date into the bill on the assumption that the effective date of the Federal bill would be March 31 and also with the understanding that any change in the date of the Federal bill would be conformed with by amending the bill presently under consideration, H. R. 7397, at the time it is considered on the floor of the House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (b) of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951 (Public Law 63, 82d Cong.) is hereby amended by striking "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "June 30, 1953" and insert "March 31, 1953."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 689, Rept. No. 2339) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That House Resolution 95, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

MOTOR CARRIERS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 713, Rept. No. 2340), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2360) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 714, Rept. No. 2341), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2357) to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers in the Interstate Commerce Act. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 715, Rept.

apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals (S. Rept. 1869)(p. 8458).

15. CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS. The Judiciary Committee reported without recommendation S. 2907, to prescribe policies and procedures to be followed by executive agencies in connection with cost-plus construction contracts (S. Rept. 1969) (p. 8459).
16. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Ken denied Secretary Brannan's charges that he has voted against things the farmers need (pp. 8518-21).
17. PUERTO RICO. Received the conference report on H. J. Res. 430, approving the Puerto Rican constitution (p. 8515).
18. TAXATION. Sen. George inserted a letter from the Treasury Department recommending various modifications of the provision in the recent tax law relating to the tax treatment of expenses of raising livestock held for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes (pp. 8516-7). He also inserted his letter to the Treasury Department objecting to several Treasury interpretations of the tax law (pp. 8517-8).
19. VETERANS' BENEFITS. H. R. 7656, to provide for education, training, and loan-guarantee benefits for veterans of the Korean conflict, was made the unfinished business (p. 8518).

BILLS INTRODUCED - June 27

20. SOIL CONSERVATION. H. R. 8400, by Rep. Curtis of Nebr., to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, etc.; to Agriculture Committee (p. 8456).
21. FOREIGN AID. H. Con. Res. 228-234, to favor the economic development and improvement of the south Asian subcontinent; to Foreign Affairs Committee (p. 8456).
22. MINERALS. S. 3408, by Sen. Cordon, to permit mineral development of certain lands acquired by the U. S.; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 8459).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX - June 27

23. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Various speeches during debate on S. 2594, to extend and amend the Defense Production Act (pp. A4264, 4267, 4268, 4280-1, 4283, 4285).
24. PERSONNEL. Speech in the House by Rep. Vursell favoring additional restrictions on annual leave (p. A4265).
25. LIVESTOCK. Rep. Harrison inserted various resolutions of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association regarding subsidies, forest administration, expenditures, mineral rights, regional development, etc. (pp. A4257-8).

HOUSE (Continued) - June 27

26. EXTENSION WORK; TOBACCO; LAND TRANSFER. The Agriculture Committee authorized Chairman Cooley to request House concurrence in the Senate amendments to H. R. 6773, to amend the authorizations for extension work in view of the 1950 census; H. R. 3554, to provide that the carry-over of Maryland tobacco for any marketing year shall be the quantity of such tobacco on hand in the U. S. on January 1 of such marketing year; and H. R. 4686, authorizing the transfer of

a tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Nebr., to the city of Crawford (p. D657).

27. FORESTRY. The Agriculture Committee agreed to defer further consideration in the current session on H. R. 3491, to abolish the Lakeview Federal sustained-yield forest unit, Oreg. (p. D657).

HOUSE - June 28

28. EXTENSION WORK; TOBACCO; LAND TRANSFER. Agreed to the Senate amendments to the bills mentioned in item 26 above (pp. 8523-4). These bills will now be sent to the President.

29. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 8370 (pp. 8526-80).

Agreed to the following amendments:

By Rep. Whitten, to prohibit use of foreign-aid funds "for the purchase of agricultural products or products produced from agricultural products not declared to be in short supply in the United States by the Secretary of Agriculture at less than the prevailing market price for such commodity within the United States or, if obtained from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, at less than the support price of such commodity including handling and storage costs" (pp. 8560-1). Before action on this amendment, a similar provision in the bill had been stricken on a point of order raised by Rep. Gary (p. 8560).

By Rep. Whitten, to add an item of \$57,130,000 for the Economic Stabilization Agency (p. 8576).

By Rep. Davis, Ga., to reduce economic and technical assistance for Asia and the Pacific from \$118,634,250 to \$67,793,000; by a 124-114 vote (pp. 8548-54).

By Rep. Williams, Miss., to cut the item for multilateral technical cooperation from \$15,708,750 to \$9,171,333; by a 112-96 vote (p. 8556).

By Rep. Keating, to reduce the funds for administrative expenses of foreign aid from \$42,000,000 to \$37,800,000; by a 101-72 vote (pp. 8558-60).

By Rep. Jensen, to limit the filling of personnel vacancies in connection with foreign aid (pp. 8561-2).

Rejected an amendment by Rep. Barrett to appropriate \$16,500,000 additional for the school-lunch program, by a 64-96 vote (pp. 8574-5).

30. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Agreed, 194-142, to the conference report on S. 2594, to amend and extend the Defense Production Act (pp. 8581-96). The Senate also agreed to the report (pp. 8602-13). This bill will now be sent to the President. The following provisions were agreed to by the conferees: Extending price and wage control through April 1953 and extending the other titles through June 1953; removing consumer credit controls and providing for removal of credit controls on housing under certain conditions; compromising the Wolcott Emergency Court of Appeals amendment; providing that OPS be required to demonstrate the validity of its regulations by "substantial" evidence instead of a "preponderance" of the evidence; to accept the Talle amendment making clear that all food processors are entitled to the Capehart amendment and that all distributors of processed foods are entitled to the Herlong amendment; eliminating the Talle de-control amendment and the Cole amendment which would have applied the historical mark-up to an individual seller; providing for import control as specified in the House provision with an amendment which permits the Secretary of Agriculture to allow imports of a commodity in an

no technical questions can be raised in any court proceedings as to the presence of a quorum. I do not imagine there will be much debate on those two matters.

Then there is a bill, H. R. 6544, in relation to the Independence National Historical Park. That concerns Philadelphia and it was brought to my attention by my colleagues from Philadelphia, the Democratic representatives and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HARDIE SCOTT] who introduced the bill. The five Democratic Congressmen have been very cooperative with him, and have asked me to program it, and I am putting it on the program for Monday. Messrs. BARRETT, GREEN, CHUDOFF, and GRANAHAN are urging that it be programed, and they are strong for the bill. At their request I am putting it down for Monday, and I think it is a good thing to do.

Then there is H. R. 8122. That is the dual parity program. That relates to the farmers of our country. I think that is 90 percent, and extending the support prices for a period of 2 years.

There is House Resolution 689, authorizing the Judiciary Committee to file reports with the Clerk of the House when the House is not in session.

Then there is H. R. 7871, the emergency flood-control bill.

If some of these bills cannot get through on Monday, I may have to get them in later on during the week, because on Tuesday there is the Private Calendar and the omnibus judges bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand there will be three conference reports also on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would also include in the names I mentioned a moment ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. My uncle is president of the Independence Hall Association, and the bill was introduced by Mr. HARDIE SCOTT, at his instance, at my request and the request of other Members of Congress from Pennsylvania. As far as I know all Members of Congress from Pennsylvania on both sides have heartily supported the Independence Hall Association. A great deal of the work is progressing. It is a beautiful sight, and when the weather is better we hope all Members of Congress will come up and see what Independence Hall looks like.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is fine. I meant to include my friend's name. It shows what united action on the part of the membership on both sides can do. The delegation of Democratic Congressmen were in to see me the other day, and they were urging that I get it on the program. I know that is pleasing to my two Republican friends from Philadelphia, and will be pleasing to the people of Philadelphia.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Any constructive action is pleasing to the Republican Members from Philadelphia.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is constructive, of course, is a question of fact. But we all agree that this is constructive.

Then there is the omnibus judge bill. On Tuesday there is the Oklahoma primary, and the usual understanding will apply to that. Any roll call on that day will go over until Wednesday.

Wednesday is Consent Calendar day and there will be suspensions. I am unable to state what the suspensions will be now because that is a matter of consultation, but I will announce them as soon as I can.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A great deal of interest is manifested on this side of the aisle as to the so-called mine safety bill. Will that be programed?

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill, in my opinion, is a "must," if we can get it up. That is one of the things under consideration, whether it will be taken up under suspension of the rules or not. I am for any action that will get it up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Inquiry is made for the information of the House, to let them know we are making an earnest effort to get it considered.

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill should come up. As far as I am concerned, and I know the gentleman from Massachusetts agrees, it is a "must." There is a tremendous feeling in favor of the bill on both sides of the aisle.

Then there is H. R. 7888, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That is on Wednesday.

I made a promise to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] that that bill would come up. It will follow the suspensions on Wednesday. Conference reports, of course, will take precedence, but that is the tentative order.

Then there is S. 2360 relating to the motor carrier securities, and

S. 2357 relating to horticultural commodities.

Any further program will be announced later with, of course, the usual reservation on conference reports.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the other Members of the House, that the Korean veterans' bill is being considered in the Senate today. I feel confident that it will pass today and that we will be able to get the conference report before the House early next week. Congress cannot afford to adjourn until that measure is finally passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we all agree with the gentleman on that.

May I say to the membership that it is very important that each Member be here every day next week.

CONSTITUTION OF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. ENGLE submitted the following conference report and statement on House Joint Resolution 430, approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2350)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language of the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was drafted by the selected delegates to the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico and adopted by the people of Puerto Rico in a referendum of March 3, 1952, in accordance with the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico', approved July 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 319; 48 U. S. C., secs. 731b-731e), is hereby approved by the Congress of the United States, except section 20 of article II of said constitution: *Provided*, That section 5 of article II thereof shall have no force and effect until amended by the people Puerto Rico under the procedure prescribed by article VII of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by adding to such section 5 the following declaration: 'Compulsory attendance at elementary public schools to the extent permitted by the facilities of the state as herein provided shall not be construed as applicable to those who receive elementary education in schools established under nongovernmental auspices': *Provided further*, That except for the purpose of adopting the amendments to section 5 of article II and to section 3 of article VII as herein provided, article VII of said constitution likewise shall have no force and effect until amended by the people of Puerto Rico under the terms of said article by adding to section 3 of article VII the following new sentence: 'Any amendment or revision of this constitution shall be consistent with the resolution enacted by the Congress of the United States approving this constitution, with the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States, with the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and with Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, adopted in the nature of a compact': *And provided further*, That the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico hereby approved shall become effective when the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico shall have declared in a formal resolution its acceptance in the name of the people of Puerto Rico of the conditions of approval herein contained, and when the Governor of Puerto Rico, being duly notified by the proper officials of the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico that such resolution of acceptance has been formally adopted, shall issue a proclamation to that effect."

CLAIR ENGLE,
LLOYD M. BENTSEN,
REVA BECK BOSONE,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
A. L. MILLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
GUY CORDON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon

and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The conference agreement deletes that portion of the Senate amendment making it mandatory that every proposed change in the new Puerto Rican Constitution be approved by the Congress of the United States. The conferees believe that in keeping with the spirit of Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, and the purposes of the Puerto Rican Constitution, the people of Puerto Rico should have freedom to change their constitution within the limits of applicable provisions of the United States Constitution, the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress and House Joint Resolution 430. Accordingly the conferees specified such limitations in detail in their amendment.

Although the Senate amended House Joint Resolution 430 by substituting a new section, most of it merely contained perfecting language. The only major change made by the Senate was the second proviso following the words "nongovernmental auspices" which would have required approval by the United States Congress of each amendment to the Puerto Rican Constitution. This proviso was stricken and the following language inserted: "Provided further, That except for the purpose of adopting the amendments to section 5 of article II and to section 3 of article VII as herein provided, article VII of said constitution likewise shall have no force and effect until amended by the people of Puerto Rico under the terms of said article by adding to section 3 of article VII the following new sentence: 'Any amendment or revision of this constitution shall be consistent with the resolution enacted by the Congress of the United States approving this constitution, with the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States, with the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and with Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, adopted in the nature of a compact:'".

CLAIR ENGLE,
LLOYD M. BENTSEN, Jr.,
REVA BECK BOSONE,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
A. L. MILLER,

Managers on the part of the House.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8370, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 13 on page 19 of the bill.

Are there further amendments to be offered at this time?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 19, line 10, after the word "bases" strike out the colon, insert a semicolon and the following: "of the total

amount appropriated in this paragraph \$12,000,000 shall be allocated to the Lowry Air Base at Denver, Colo."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is designed for the purpose of protecting lives and property within my own congressional district. This is based upon a survey that has been made and is the result of four plane crashes at Lowry Field air base, Denver, Colo., within the last 8 years.

At the time the Korean war broke out they moved the training command of the B-29 gunnery to Lowry Field with the result that the Lowry Field air base, which at that time had a runway of approximately 8,000 feet, was unable properly to handle the B-29's without hazard to the people of the city and county of Denver. In the fall of last year a B-29 crashed near this base and it resulted in the death of eight airmen. Fortunately no civilians were killed. At the time of the crash it hit approximately a block of houses within the city and county of Denver and it was only two blocks from a school in which there were approximately 250 children.

We of the Colorado delegation took this matter up with the Air Force. I direct attention to page 34 of the committee report in which it is stated:

In the first place, the committee learned that the 1952 public works program for the three services was far from being firm, even though the committee had been given assurances at the time that the program was firm. As to the 1953 program, the committee learned from the Director of the Budget that it had been presented to both the Armed Services Committee and to this committee at too late a date "to do an effective job of reviewing and examining."

May I point out to the members of the committee that we asked the Air Force to take this up, which they did. We submitted to them many suggestions as to the proper method and manner of meeting this hazard as it exists at Lowry Air Base.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Did the gentleman go before the committee and ask for a hearing on this item?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. We first took it up with the Air Force through the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TABER. But the gentleman did not go before the Appropriations Subcommittee so that it might have an opportunity to look into that particular matter?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct. This is not an additional appropriation nor is there an additional amount requested.

Mr. TABER. It is not included with the budget estimate?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the \$1,200,000,000? I do not know. The only thing I do know is that according to the report submitted by the committee no mention or reference whatsoever is made to Lowry Air Force Base at all and because of that and because of the hazards and dangers in connection therewith and because of the statement made by the re-

port of the committee, I feel that this is the only opportunity the Air Force will have to rectify the condition that exists at the present time. According to the report that they gave to the Colorado delegation, they estimate it will cost approximately \$12,000,000 to get this job done.

(On request of Mr. MAHON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is to be commended for his interest in Lowry Field. But is it not true that there is no authorization for this project which he is discussing, there are no funds in the bill for it and no request for funds for this project either through the Armed Services Committee or the Committee on Appropriations? It is true also that if these funds are given to Lowry Field they will have to be taken away from other very essential projects. We have already cut the Air Force request by a half billion dollars. It may be stated also that Lowry Field was given \$25,000,000 in the appropriation bill of last year, much of which is unexpended. I know the gentleman is truly concerned about the problem but the gentleman will agree that if officials use the balance of the \$25,000,000 and they want additional funds they may apply for them. I think the gentleman should withdraw his amendment because, in my opinion, the House will not adopt the amendment under the circumstances. There is nothing that would justify the gentleman's request at this time.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well then, if that is true, may I ask the gentleman what is the meaning of your report on page 34? You say:

As to the 1953 program the committee learned from the Director of the Budget that it had been presented to both the Committee on Armed Services and to this committee too late a date to do an effective job of reviewing and examining.

Then you go ahead and you state positively here that they have no firm commitments.

Mr. MAHON. The bases are listed, and in the justifications and the hearings the amounts are provided for each base. But, Lowry Field is not among those included. So, it seems to me that the gentleman's amendment is premature. It might be appropriate next year, but I cannot see how it would be applicable at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post there is an article regarding the Wholesale Liquor Dealers Association, headed by Mr. Kronheim, who testified regarding political contributions. In one paragraph it lists me as having received \$100 contribution from the liquor dealers. A man named Porter was reported to have said by the Washington Post that in 1949 he made certain contributions to various Democratic Members of the Congress totaling \$5,800 and \$100 to EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican of Massachusetts.

It is my practice, Mr. Chairman, not to take any contributions for my campaigns. I certainly did not receive or take \$100 from Mr. Porter. I hope the Washington Post will correct the error. I believe Mr. Porter did not make any such statement before the committee. He could not have, because it is not true. And a member of the House Committee said that my name was not mentioned, at the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I admire, naturally, the solicitude of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers] in looking after the interests of the air base at Lowry Field. Lowry Field is a great air base of the Air Force. I have had occasion to inspect it in the past, but they do have there at the present time, Mr. Chairman, a real problem due to the hazards surrounding the approaches to the field and the crowded conditions around it. I discussed the matter with the Air Force, and the matter is being investigated to see how the hazard can be removed and the normal use of the field continued. I think in fairness to Lowry Field the best thing to do is to let this matter run its regular course. A commission headed by General Doolittle has been set up to study this problem, due to the fact that not only at Lowry Field, but at other fields throughout the Nation, there are hazards to the approaches to the fields. That commission is working hard on the problem. Lowry, perhaps, is not in better shape than any other air base in the country in this respect. When we get the report from the Doolittle committee I think we will know what the situation is with reference to Lowry Field.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that this matter has been referred to the Air Force; that they have made an estimate and determined that there is this hazard to the people of the city of Denver.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; there is that hazard, and they want to do something to relieve the situation to protect Lowry Field. I agree with the gentleman that Lowry Field is a great air base, and it is a valuable asset to the Air Force.

Mr. MAHON. They have \$45,000,000 they have not used.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That was given under a program of training between 18,000 and 20,000 men, and that was for barracks and facilities. I did not understand it was to be used for runway purposes, hence this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Riley].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado), there were—ayes 21, noes 90. So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 19, line 2, strike out "\$1,200,000,000" and insert "\$1,120,000,000."

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike \$80,000,000 from this item of \$1,200,000,000. The reason for this amendment is found in a report which was presented to and adopted by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments earlier in the week. A subcommittee of that committee on which served the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling], the gentleman from California [Mr. Shelley], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Lantaff], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Baring], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Riehlman], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bender], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader], joined in an unanimous report, adopted by the full committee without objection and which reads as follows:

JUNE 27, 1952.

OVERPROGRAMING FOR AIR FORCE DORMITORY CONSTRUCTION INTRODUCTION

The subcommittee has found that over \$80,000,000 of programed expenditures for Air Force troop housing is unnecessary. This finding resulted from a base-by-base analysis of 105 major Air Force bases, using figures furnished by the Air Force. In testimony at a hearing the Air Force has acknowledged the accuracy of the subcommittee's analysis and has already initiated action to correct deficiencies in policies and procedures on housing its airmen which would have resulted in building more dormitories than it needs. Simply stated, this would amount to excess building of more than 200 three-story dormitories costing \$400,000 each.

The subject of airmen's housing formed a major part of the study of construction at Andrews Air Force Base on which this subcommittee reported to the Congress March 20, 1952 (H. Rept. No. 1623, 82d Cong.). In the report on Andrews the Air Force was found to be planning new dormitories to replace serviceable buildings which had been recently rehabilitated at considerable expense. The Air Force has now advised us that since our earlier report it has strength-

ened this aspect of its policy. It has applied this revised policy to other bases with a saving of \$13,199,000 worth of barracks planned to be built. Following that report, the subcommittee expanded its inquiry to a consideration of over-all Air Force housing in continental United States.

BASIS OF THIS REPORT

Air Force method of computing dormitory requirements

The Air Force policy was to build dormitories for 80 percent of its airmen, on the theory that 20 percent of the men have dependents and will live in homes either on or off the base. At bases where the Air Force estimates that homes for these married airmen would not be available either on the base or in the community, it planned to build dormitory spaces for these men also. A low estimate of the number of houses available in the community (an uncertain and variable factor) results in a higher requirement for dormitory spaces on the base.

Percentage of married airmen

Studies prepared by the Air Force show that 32.2 percent of all airmen are married. Exclusive of the air training command, 30.1 percent live with their dependents.

Excess spaces

The analysis showed that about 30 percent of the buildings for airmen's housing which the Air Force plans to construct would not be needed in the foreseeable future. At a simple 80 percent of troop strength 21.3 percent of the buildings are excess; on the basis of family housing needs reported by the Air Force to the Housing and Home Finance Agency 29.7 percent of the buildings are excess; on the basis of current experience in family housing 33.4 percent of the buildings are excess.

Two factors inflated the Air Force's estimates of dormitory requirements as presented to the Congress.

(1) The estimate of houses available in the communities at each base was grossly underestimated. For example:

	Airmen actually living in the community as of Jan. 31, 1952	Air Force estimates of homes available in the community
Eglin AFB, Valpariso, Fla.	1,835	0
Kelly AFB, San Antonio, Tex.	1,643	0
Rapid City AFB, Rapid City, S. Dak.	1,047	100
Castle AFB, Merced, Calif.	1,925	200
McChord AFB, Tacoma, Wash.	1,407	300

The Air Force is also promoting a program of family housing construction by private agencies. This is done through a finding that an area is a critical area and developing with the Housing and Home Finance Agency relaxed credit and mortgage insurance commitments as a means to induce construction. The effect of this coupled with the dormitory construction would be to provide dormitories and private houses for the same airmen.

(1) The second factor concerns the percentage of airmen for whom dormitory spaces are programed. Although 30 percent of the airmen live off base with dependents, the Air Force policy was to build dormitories to accommodate at least 80 percent of its enlisted strength. This had the effect of providing rooms for at least 10 percent of the airmen who obviously will not occupy the space. The explanation offered the subcommittee for this wasteful program was that prior to Korea only the higher ranks of married enlisted men, approximately 20 percent, were allowed to live off base. Those

airmen in the lower ranks who married were not allowed to reenlist. After Korea Congress granted quarters allowance to the lower ranks of enlisted men with dependents. These men now, in the main, also live off base. The Air Force has taken the position that at some time in the future it will be able to return to its old policy and require that these airmen, about 10 percent of its strength, live on the base. Consequently, the Air Force was building, or was planning to build, the extra dormitories on the supposition that they might be needed in the future, and even this supposition was predicated on congressional action.

This future need for additional dormitories will not spring up overnight. If it should ever arise, the present allowance of 72 square feet per man provides an ample cushion, while new construction is planned and speeded to meet the needs. All of the additional 10 percent now living off the bases could be housed in dormitories on the bases by temporarily reducing individual space allowances to 63 square feet, well above the minimum space allowance established by the Secretary of Defense.

Based on a space allowance of 72 square feet per man it is estimated that there is a surplus of 25,808 spaces in the 1952 program, about \$51,616,000, and a surplus in the bill now before Congress of 16,051 spaces, about \$32,102,000. (A list of the bases where excess dormitories would have been built by 1955 and the approximate cost, will be found appended to this report.)

CONCLUSIONS

The Air Force has already secured in its 1952 appropriation more than \$50,000,000 which it does not need, and has been authorized by the House for its 1953 program over \$30,000,000 which it does not need. The appropriation for this latter authorization is about to be considered by the House. These excesses were caused by using faulty estimates of housing dormitories for men who would not live on the base.

Following our first hearing and prior to the hearing held on June 26, 1952, the Air Force changed its policy. Dormitories will now be built to house only 70 percent of the enlisted strength to conform to conditions as they actually exist. Assurances have been provided that action to correct other deficiencies in policies and procedures with respect to airmen's housing have now been initiated by the Air Force. These corrections should include quick and decisive action not only to eliminate future contracts for excess dormitories but to cancel contracts for such dormitories which have been already awarded.

The committee has not had an opportunity to study the wisdom of requiring a rescission of the more than \$50,000,000 of excess appropriation provided for fiscal 1952 and recommends to the Appropriations Committee a close scrutiny of this subject.

With respect to the appropriation for fiscal 1953, the committee is not yet advised as to the amount requested or allowed by the Appropriations Committee. If the full amount has been included in the bill to be considered by the House, an amendment should be offered to reduce the appropriation for dormitory construction by at least \$30,000,000.

The Air Force is a young organization and has had limited experience in coping with the tremendous administrative responsibilities involved in its operations. Competent leadership is required to correct its inefficiencies. The committee is grateful particularly to Assistant Secretary Edwin V. Huggins for his cooperative attitude and for his manifest determination to make improvements. It is unfortunate that a congressional committee had to point out the deficiencies herein discussed but it is gratifying that Secretary Huggins has taken

prompt corrective action. We believe that he has a consciousness of the necessity for economy in the operations of the Air Force. He has assured us that faulty policies have been corrected and that he will seek to eliminate ineptitude in effectuating those policies.

When added together the unnecessary programed expenditures discussed in this report aggregate nearly \$100,000,000. It is gratifying to have assurance from the Air Force Assistant Secretary that he will not permit the construction of barracks which are destined to stand empty.

Alexandria Air Force Base, Alexandria, La.	\$1,314,000
Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.	574,000
Ardmore Air Force Base, Ardmore, Okla.	412,000
Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.	1,440,000
Camp Beale Air Force Base, Camp Beale, Calif.	2,154,000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas	492,000
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.	776,000
Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.	822,000
Bryan Air Force Base, Bryan, Tex.	612,000
Campbell Air Force Base, Hopkinsville, Ky.	214,000
Carswell Air Force Base, Ft. Worth, Tex.	1,380,000
Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.	1,082,000
Charlestown Air Force Base, Charlestown, S. C.	820,000
Clinton Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.	1,468,000
James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.	1,070,000
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.	1,028,000
Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C.	1,328,000
Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.	1,914,000
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc Lake, Calif.	1,842,000
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.	3,594,000
Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colo.	604,000
Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.	1,112,000
Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.	2,860,000
Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Tex.	398,000
Galveston Air Force Base, Galveston, Tex.	566,000
Grandview Air Force Base, Grandview, Mo.	674,000
Great Falls Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.	434,000
Gunter Air Force Base, Gunter, Ala.	354,000
Hanscom Air Force Base, Bedford, Mass.	1,122,000
Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Tex.	1,404,000
Holoman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.	698,000
Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.	1,556,000
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.	11,488,000
Kinross Air Force Base, Kinross, Mich.	528,000
Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. M.	2,568,000
Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.	2,652,000
Lakeland Air Force Base, Lakeland, Fla.	818,000
Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.	1,754,000
Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Tex.	698,000

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.	\$1,540,000
Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.	754,000
Lawson Air Force Base, Columbus, Ga.	690,000
Limestone Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine.	1,878,000
Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.	2,700,000
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio.	2,412,000
March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.	2,018,000
Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.	856,000
McGuire Air Force Base, McGuire, N. J.	734,000
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho.	4,332,000
Newcastle Air Force Base, Newcastle, Del.	650,000
Niagara Falls Air Force Base, Niagara Falls, N. Y.	290,000
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.	666,000
O'Hare Air Force Base, O'Hare, Ill.	302,000
Paine Air Force Base, Paine, Wash.	366,000
Palm Beach Air Force Base, Palm Beach, Fla.	2,320,000
Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.	548,000
Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg, N. Y.	498,000
Pope Air Force Base, Ft. Bragg, N. C.	2,496,000
Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.	2,276,000
Raleigh-Durham Air Force Base, Raleigh, N. C.	390,000
Rapid City Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.	710,000
Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex.	574,000
Sedalia Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo.	1,396,000
Selfridge Air Force Base, Selfridge, Mich.	588,000
Selman Air Force Base, Monroe, La.	1,310,000
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C.	560,000
Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.	4,328,000
Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.	232,000
Suffolk County Air Force Base, Suffolk County, N. Y.	1,016,000
Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.	1,802,000
Truax Air Force Base, Truax, Wis.	370,000
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. M.	778,000
Wichita Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.	618,000
Camp Wolters Air Force Base, Camp Wolters, Tex.	1,700,000

Let me repeat two statements, from the report:

The subcommittee has found that over \$80,000,000 of programed expenditures for Air Force troop housing is unnecessary. This finding resulted from a base-by-base analysis of 105 major Air Force bases, using figures furnished by the Air Force. In testimony at a hearing the Air Force has acknowledged the accuracy of the subcommittee's analysis.

The Air Force has already secured in its 1952 appropriation more than \$50,000,000 which it does not need, and has been authorized by the House for its 1953 program over \$30,000,000 which it does not need.

Note the situation: This matter was before the Committee on Appropriations, and the Air Force succeeded in persuad-

ing that committee through its subcommittee to give it this \$80,000,000, which the amendment would strike, which the Hardy committee finds—and mark this—and which the Air Force now agrees it does not need. Why not recapture that amount from the total of this particular item which carries it. This reduction will not result in less money for any other activity which the Committee on Appropriations has passed upon. It but strikes from the \$1,200,000,000 the \$80,000,000 which the Air Force says it does not need for the purpose for which it was requested.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman makes a good point. It has been anticipated that 80 percent of the airmen would be single, whereas only 70 percent are single and live in these barracks so they are not going to need as many barracks as they thought they would need. In the whole program, they have only had about one-fifth of what they need, and in the whole program they need far more barracks than they have had. In view of the fact that we have cut the Air Force request here by over a half-billion dollars and taking into consideration in that cut the problem which the gentleman has presented, I think it would be dangerous for us to cut any deeper.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I get the argument. I assume the gentleman will make this same argument when he opposes the amendment. What his argument amounts to is this. And here are the facts, and let us not get away from it. The Air Force asked the Committee on Appropriations and it got \$50,000,000 for 1952, and \$30,000,000 for 1953 for the construction of barracks. The committee headed by Mr. HARDY, and all the credit belongs to the gentleman from Virginia and to the members of his subcommittee. I merely picked it up because I understood it would not be offered on the majority side—now look—the Air Force got this \$80,000,000. They admit they do not need it, and the argument of the gentleman opposing it is this: That the Air Force program will be expanded at some time in the future, and therefore the Committee on Appropriations having authorized \$80,000,000 too much the gentleman contends we should permit the Air Force to keep it on hand for some future activity. That ignores the principle and the practice that the Committee on Appropriations should be advised accurately of what the Air Force or any other force needs when asked to make appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MAHON), Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan was permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; but will the gentleman give me one of the minutes that he has secured?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Now the Air Force people have come repeatedly to the committee and asked to reprogram some of these items for which funds have been provided because with experience they are learning, for example, that they do not need as many barracks per man as they thought they needed. So the committee has been consulted, and has agreed to these reprogramming efforts on the part of the Air Force, and all the money will be required for the Air Force program.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, now will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now look here. This is the fact and you cannot get away from it. The Air Force went to the Committee on Appropriations, and it asked for \$80,000,000 which is carried in this bill, in this item and which it now says it does not need for the purpose for which it was requested. The argument of the gentleman is only this: We should let them have this \$80,000,000; to spend some time in the future for any purpose it may consider desirable. And the answer to that is that when they or any department wants money, it should go first to the Committee on Appropriations and they should give them accurate information justifying their request. Otherwise why an appropriation committee? Why not a lump sum over all appropriations? No one is claiming any fraud or anything like that, they just did not figure out right. They have \$80,000,000 they do not need, and my argument is that we should take it out of this item and then let the Air Force, if they are expanding or if they need it for other purposes, come back to the Committee on Appropriations and ask for the money it needs for any purpose and the House will give them what they need. We should not leave \$80,000,000 million floating around somewhere in the air hoping or expecting that the Air Force is going to need and spend it for something—some purpose for which it was not appropriated. We have too much of that now.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If my time has not expired, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. TABER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. TABER. When we took up this appropriation we were told, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] said, they had figured their barracks proposition too heavy. That was one of the elements that resulted in the reduction for construction by the Air Force in the United States and overseas of \$568,000,000. If that is not enough to cover this situation where they do not need the money, that would be one thing, but I think we should have something to show that the \$568,000,000 cut is not enough. I wonder if there is anything along that line in sight.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Here is the answer to that: It is the same answer I have given before. The Air Force comes

before the Appropriations Committee. It says, "We need money for barracks, including barracks, down here at Andrews Field." They get the money, fifty million for 1952 and thirty million for 1953. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and his subcommittee go into this matter and they find, and the Assistant Secretary agrees with them, that they do not need, they do not intend to use that fifty and thirty million dollars.

My point is only this: That that item of \$80,000,000 included in this total should be taken out. Then, if later the Air Force finds it needs the money, let it come to the Appropriations Committee. Any other course would establish a policy of giving them what they ask, in that and every department, and then, when they find they made a mistake, that the request was too large, leave it in there, put it through the House even when there is no need for it, even though it is admitted that had the facts been known the Appropriations Committee would not have included it.

Mr. GROSS. Any other course negates the action of the Hardy committee, does it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the gentleman will speak for himself. I can see little to be gained by investigation if not followed by appropriate action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the matter I tried to clear up in the closing minutes of the debate yesterday. I tried rather unsuccessfully to get it understood. Maybe my presentation was not clear, but I am not sure that the explanations provided by the committee were full and complete.

I had given some consideration to offering an amendment similar to that offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I decided not to do it because I was not able to determine what effect it might have on the Air Force, and my thoughts ran along the line of the discussion which was raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] a moment ago.

There are two aspects to this amendment. One of them is the question of the more than \$30,000,000 in the authorization for 1953, which the Air Force cannot and will not use. I have no way of knowing the extent to which the reduction in barracks construction was given consideration by the Appropriations Committee, and whether a substantial part of that five hundred and sixty-eight million cut which the Appropriations Committee made was based on this barracks reduction. If the gentleman can answer that question, I can determine my own position, or what my position should be with respect to this amendment.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RILEY. If the gentleman will look at pages 37 and 38 of the committee's report under the category "Housing, troop and family," he will find that

the committee has recommended appropriations of between 50 and 60 percent of the authorized housing as authorized by the Armed Services Committee, which is considerably less, I believe, than the figure the gentleman is dealing with.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will straighten this out for me I would appreciate it; I do not know just what he means by 50 percent of the housing. Does that refer to troop housing, family housing, or what?

Mr. RILEY. It is troop and family housing. There is no family housing for the zone of the interior; but there is some for these isolated foreign stations.

Mr. HARDY. My recollection of the authorization bill is that it included amounts for troop housing aggregating \$115,000,000 in the continental United States. Am I to understand from the gentleman from South Carolina that in working out the cut which would be applied to the Air Force on its troop housing construction that you instructed them to cut their construction for this year by 50 percent?

Mr. RILEY. We are not asking for more than 50 percent of the amount which has been authorized. I would like to say to the gentleman from Virginia that we have instructed the Air Force to build operational facilities first, even if some of the men have to live in tents; let the barracks come second; the runways, maintenance shops, fuel systems, and things of that kind have to come first. If the gentleman will look at the way this is set up by categories I believe he will find this is true.

Mr. HARDY. I am trying to figure it out, but I say to the gentleman that I cannot understand the hieroglyphics of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman from New York can straighten me out I would be delighted to yield.

Mr. TABER. I just want to get this straight: For housing in this country the authorization figure involved \$162,399,000.

Mr. HARDY. That was the total for housing.

Mr. TABER. That is the total amount; and the figure that was allowed was \$98,000,000.

Mr. HARDY. For total housing.

Mr. TABER. That would be subject to about a 4-percent reduction because we knocked off \$50,000,000 from these total figures.

Mr. HARDY. On the basis of that it would seem to me that the Appropriations Committee has in effect said: You cannot build more than approximately half the amount of troop housing which you have requested.

Mr. TABER. And on the overseas picture—

Mr. HARDY. I think we might skip that, if the gentleman does not mind, because I am talking about housing in the United States.

There is one other question insofar as I am concerned with respect to continental United States troop housing: With the reduction which the Appropriations

Committee has already made I believe that that phase of this amendment should be defeated.

There is one other aspect of it which I think we should still get straight and that is that more than \$50,000,000 of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 1952 have not been expended and the Air Force now says it does not need and will not expend these funds for barracks: Should there be a rescission of that? Or what should we do about it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(On request of Mr. MAHON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HARDY was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. In the request for public works funds last year—

Mr. TABER. This is last year?

Mr. HARDY. Fiscal 1952.

Mr. MAHON. Fiscal 1952, a large reduction was made in the request for public works of the Air Force which more than accommodates itself to the issue which the gentleman raises. We have over-authorized for housing but we have under-appropriated for housing.

Mr. HARDY. As I recall the testimony of Secretary Huggins on this particular point he advised our subcommittee that the Appropriations Committee had given the Air Force an order to secure their public works construction with \$200,000,000 less than they had asked for; that is for fiscal 1952, I am talking about. Am I to understand that \$50,000,000 of that \$200,000,000 which you told them to hold down is represented by this troop housing?

Mr. MAHON. I think that would be a fair statement. Most of the funds have not been expended, but officials will be back for more next spring. We are at the beginning of a buildup of the Air Force from 95 to 143 wings.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman should know if he does not know that in reference to the matter of going from 95 to 143 wings the actual requirements for troop housing are on many bases reduced.

Mr. MAHON. The over-all requirement for 143 wings is certainly greater for housing than for 95 wings.

Mr. HARDY. I think the gentleman has satisfied me reasonably well. In view of the fact that there was a curtailment in their total funds in the 1952 program of \$200,000,000, and this represents only \$50,000,000, it would simply avoid having them appear and ask for restoration of the \$50,000,000 for some other purposes.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. This report by the Hardy committee is a good example of the information which we on the Committee on Appropriations should have. If the Committee on Appropriations would take greater advantage of committees such as the Hardy committee we could do a better job in the handling of budget requests.

Secondly, we would be most unwise if we did not take advantage of the specific recommendations of the Hardy committee in this instance. They have pointed out clear-cut reasons why we should make this reduction totaling \$80,000,000. The argument has been made that if we do not disturb the present recommended funds in the long run it will balance out in the end. Members of this subcommittee on appropriations contend certain reductions take into account the facts submitted to the Congress by the Hardy committee.

This is a loose and slipshod method. We should make the Air Force account for everything they cannot spend. What they cannot spend we should take away from them. We should not let these funds drift back and forth without firm control by the Congress.

To keep the Air Force on record as to where they spend their money we should approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this effort to economize unduly on troop housing and family housing is false economy. There is no branch of the service that needs housing worse than the Air Force does today. I have seen the housing that is being used by the Air Force, and some of it is not fit to house human beings. Yet we are taking men out of civilian life by the draft and housing them under conditions which we should be ashamed of. I want to say this further: That when we take a man into the armed services we obligate ourselves to give that man reasonable housing; and when we fail to appropriate money as we have failed in the past to appropriate money for the men in the armed services, we are welching on the obligation that we have to the servicemen of this country.

It is false economy, Mr. Chairman, because the men that go into the service do not stay in the service when they are inadequately housed. It is false economy because when you take a man with a wife and a family into the service you do not keep him at all. It is false economy because we provide the sum of \$51.30 for a private first class with one dependent per month. It is false economy because when we do not provide the housing ourselves we give the serviceman, the private first class, \$77.10 if he has two dependents and we give a man with over two dependents \$96.90,

and we are not saving money when we pay them the housing allotments that we do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, being a member of the Hardy committee, I want first to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] on an outstanding piece of work for the people of this country in pin pointing and exposing a wasteful practice. With the confusion about the appropriation as developed in this debate, I am afraid we are not going to take full advantage of that investigative work.

Certainly this must be true. The Committee on Appropriations made whatever cuts it did wholly without knowledge of the facts developed by the Hardy committee. The lack of need for the \$80,000,000, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] would strike out, was not known to the Committee on Appropriations when it acted. Therefore, if the cut the Appropriations Committee made could be substantiated before, certainly you can add \$80,000,000 and leave the situation exactly where it was, because the Committee on Appropriations did not act on the basis of this information which has been developed by the Hardy committee only within the last week.

I want to point out that in addition to the \$80,000,000, the Air Force also admits that there is \$13,000,000, at least, that they can save on other bases, by fixing over existing barracks, based on the Andrews Field report of the Hardy committee. So, in this bill you are giving the Air Force \$93,000,000 they do not need, instead of \$80,000,000, and the \$13,000,000 is not the complete picture. That is simply the amount saved on a survey which is far from finished. We do not know how much more may be saved.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman should emphasize the fact that the Air Force itself admits that this money is not needed.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman. These facts were only known within the last week. The Committee on Appropriations could not have acted on the basis of this knowledge, because it was finally confirmed only day before yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be perfectly frank with the committee. I am going to tell you just how I feel. There is no such situation as the gentleman from Louisiana describes. There is no use kidding yourselves about that.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I decline to yield. I want the gentleman to understand what the picture is.

There is no situation where anybody in the Air Force is without adequate housing today. These people have not been able to build the things that have been provided for. On top of that, the \$50,000,000 that has been developed in the report here that is not needed for construction certainly ought to be taken into consideration. We did take into consideration that they did not need a considerable portion of the funds in the 1953 budget. They evidently had \$50,000,000 of surplus in the 1952 funds. This amendment would not take it out, but it would reduce the over-all building funds. They probably have plenty of funds to let all the contracts they ought to let, even if this amendment were adopted. Frankly, I think that \$50,000,000 is about as far as it ought to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the Hardy committee has done a magnificent job. I think we are all interested in trying to get economy practiced in our Armed Forces. But I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Subcommittee on Public Works for the Military has been studying since the 1st of February on its own account the constructing programs of all three services. We have gone into the matter thoroughly. We have studied it from every angle possible within that time, and we have taken into consideration the figures which have been shown here today.

I believe, and I think the other members of the subcommittee will agree with me, that every dollar we have appropriated here today is necessary to carry out the program. We have cut these people to the bone and scraped some of the bone in order to make them come up with a firm, reasonable, well-planned program.

There are bases on which you will have to have troop housing. It may be that some of these men are going to have to live in tents on some of these bases. There may be bases already constructed on which there is a surplus of housing, but I submit to you that when you cut the authorization and the request by 50 percent you have cut it enough. I am not going to stand in the way of training Air Force men and I am not going to send the sons of America into air bases where they do not have at least reasonable housing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I should like to make this observation: I believe that if you have already reduced the troop housing item by 50 percent, as stated by the gentlemen, that is a sufficient cut. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. RILEY. I thank the gentleman very much for that contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RILEY) there were—ayes 65, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 19, line 5, after the word "Missouri" strike out the comma and insert a colon, and on page 19 strike out all on lines 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 to the words "Provided further."

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] made a very fine statement protesting vigorously against the creation of new military installations when we have presently existing installations which can be expanded and used, and the taxpayers of the country saved many millions of dollars. I commend the gentleman for his statement of yesterday, and the amendment which I offer today is in line with that. It would simply stop any further construction of this air base at Grandview, Mo., this conversion of a cow pasture municipal airport into an air base. Last year, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], when that subject was under debate, said that this would eventually cost the taxpayers of this country about \$40,000,000. I believe the top figure he used was \$40,000,000. This is a good place to stop this thing. Last year it was contended and an appropriation of \$13,000,000 was provided, that this air base was an urgent proposition, and had to be built right now—right away—no loss of time. A year has gone by, and if I am correctly informed, there has been no more than a million dollars spent on this air base at Grandview, Mo. There are plenty of air bases in the Middle West, which can be expanded. There is an air base at Ottumwa, Iowa, which can be used. It is of permanent, brick construction. I want to point out that it is not in my district. It can be used as an air base. There are plenty of air bases presently existing in the Middle West. Let us use those bases. This is foot-in-the-door legislation. Let us get the foot out of the door.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman realize that there is no money in this bill for the Grandview Air Base so it seems to me that his amendment would not be effective in this regard.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas, there is no way in the world that I can tell whether there

is any money in this bill, whether by some of the devious language in this bill, unexpended balances may be made available for expenditure at Grandview. At least it will be the intent of the Congress here that we do not want to go on with this proposition down there when we have air bases within a comparatively few air miles of Grandview, Mo., which can well be expanded, and air bases that can well be activated, which today are standing idle and falling into ruin.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the able gentleman from Kansas who is constantly striving for efficiency and economy in the Military Establishment.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I can confirm the statement made by the gentleman from Texas that there is no money in this bill for Grandview. I would point out that if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, and construction of Grandview proceeds, we would be in the position of doing this: Kansas City, Mo., is holding an election this coming month, July, to turn over the title to the Air Force. If we adopt this amendment I am afraid word will go out to Kansas City that the Air Force does not want fee title, and then the citizens will vote not to grant the fee and we will be in a worse position.

Mr. GROSS. But they have a lease for 25 years which the Government can cancel at will.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Fee title is far better than any 25-year lease, as I am sure the gentleman would agree. I admire the gentleman's zeal in ferreting out these instances of waste; but, as I said, there is no money in this bill for Grandview.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to do is to get this thing stopped, and save the taxpayers an eventual expenditure of \$40,000,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Any saving to the taxpayers is to be commended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Wood] is recognized.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield back my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], which in my opinion is in effect another effort to again try to discredit a sound and worth while project. I opposed the gentleman successfully last year when he offered a similar amendment. I am sure that no Member of this body will be influenced by his perhaps unintentional but apparent misstatements regarding this matter. Could it be that the gentleman is more zealous about the fact that there are perhaps less desirable locations in his own State of Iowa that he would like to see used than he is for his protestations for economy.

The gentleman questions the Grandview, Mo., program of the Air Force because it happens to be in the same county as the home of the President. He evidently approves of all others as he makes no attack on them. As before he slurringly refers to this fine airfield site as a cow pasture, strangely reflecting on everybody's judgment except his own.

He has been advised by members of the committee that his amendment serves no useful purpose because in this present bill no money is being appropriated for its construction—yet he has refused to withdraw his amendment as requested. I feel sure that so much displeasure was felt when the same efforts failed last time that it could possibly be the reason for this action.

I would like to tell the Members that in my opinion much more work has been done and the progress of the major objectives is further along than the gentleman from Iowa would lead you to believe. Only a few days ago the announcements were made regarding the letting of several large contracts for all types of work on the Grandview installations.

I ask the Members to defeat the Gross amendment decisively so that we may remove the incentive for further unwarranted criticism. The Members will remember a much clearer picture of this entire situation was given to the House a year ago by me when the actual consideration of the approval was before us. Therefore it is not my intention to take up further time now of the Members in a repetition of my remarks.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Iowa if he will withdraw his amendment, inasmuch as there is no appropriation in this bill for Grandview.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly not.

Mr. RILEY. Then I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 19, line 2, strike out "\$1,200,000,000" and insert "\$1,170,000,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have had much worth-while discussion on this particular item. I do think we should try to save a little at least, and from all the evidence given we can cut this \$30 million, instead of the \$80,000,000 previously offered, without doing the Air Force the least harm. I believe I can say that this is entirely in agreement with Mr. Taber's viewpoint, is it not?

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It will be far better to utilize this \$30 million to construct additional jet fighters and bombers, than to construct barracks for which there is no need. Let us help give the men in Korea more planes instead of duplicating construction of unneeded buildings. I hope the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are now in the midst of the build-up of the Air Force to 143 wings. Of course, it is far below what we need to have if we are to have overwhelming superiority in the air. The Air Force officials came and asked us for \$2,000,000,000 at this time for public works. There is no doubt in the world

in my mind that they do need \$2,000,000,000 for public works. Not only do they not need that, they need twice as much more later on to finish this build-up to 143 wings. But by reason of the work of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] and his subcommittee, and by reason of the dissatisfaction of the committee with the program presented, the committee said, "Gentlemen, we are for air power. We do not want to cut the striking force of this Nation. We know that this is a dangerous world, but we do not believe you are ready to obligate or spend the money you are asking for. Go back to the Pentagon, get your pencils and work with us and bring us something realistic."

So we worked with them on this program. Finally they said if we would give them in cash \$1,250,000,000 they could go forward with this program without slowing down the essential construction until next spring, when they expect to come in for a supplemental, for additional funds. They said, "If you will give up this money, we will take the responsibility for pushing the program forward as fast as it can be pushed." Some Members wanted to make another reduction. So a majority of the Members voted to reduce the figure to \$1,200,000,000. This proposed amendment is a reduction of \$30,000,000 more, and we are maneuvering the Congress into this position: Then we will take the responsibility ourselves for retarding a program which is already far behind schedule when the responsibility had been assumed by the Air Force when they said: "We can go ahead with maximum speed on \$1,250,000,000."

It, therefore, seems to me that in order to put the bee on the Air Force, so to speak, in order to say: "You said you could deliver on \$1,250,000,000. Now, go ahead and deliver; it is your responsibility, you said you could do it." That is where we have got them. But we transfer the responsibility to ourselves if we make further reductions in this bill. It seems to me we should not make this reduction of \$30,000,000.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Is it not also true that the Air Force is having to absorb in this \$1,250,000,000 an additional \$52,000,000 for planning and engineering which they had asked for?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. That is far more than the funds involved in the controversy over barracks which we discussed last year. We cut them more than enough to take care of the barracks picture last year. Let us not maneuver ourselves into the position of trying to stringhalt the Air Force at this time; let us give them the ball and ask them to run with it. Under the circumstances we are strategically in the right position, so let us not maneuver ourselves out of it.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. As to the order of priority of the various construction items which are listed on pages 39 and 40, are

we to assume that because those items are numbered that that is any indication of their priority?

Mr. MAHON. Not necessarily. Not at all.

Mr. ELSTON. Or does the Air Force have the discretion to take them up in such order of priority as they see fit?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield—

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Did they not refuse absolutely to give us any priority? They could not give us any.

Mr. MAHON. As to whether or not you want a runway built or a parking apron, it would be difficult to give any priority; each is just as important as the other. It has to be left to them if they are to operate successfully.

Mr. ELSTON. Is there any priority as to stations or locations? Are they required to take any particular one?

Mr. MAHON. These stations are listed in the report; they are all authorized, and they are the stations upon which the funds will be expended. There is no priority as to stations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on this business of constructing barracks for the Air Force, I have one small installation in my district, one of those so-called classified installations. I made an inspection of it last fall at the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I believe he sent a similar letter to every Member of Congress urging inspections of installations in their districts. I found there a hotel dormitory type of barracks. I have kicked around over the country in years past and I have stayed in many, many hotels that were inferior to the dormitory type of barracks that has been built in my district at heaven only knows how much extravagance and waste of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that particular point?

Mr. GROSS. No, not at this time.

I saw there a Bendix washer and clothesdrier for every 9 men. I remember back in 1917 in World War I when I was in the service we did our washing with a scrub brush. Today, a Bendix clothes drier and a Bendix washer for every 9 men! Inlaid asphalt floors, beautifully veneered doors for every room, locks on the doors—mind you, brass or bronze door knobs and locks. I put in 3 years in the service but this is the first time in my life that I ever saw a setup where an enlisted man could lock himself in his room.

This is the place where, I told you last year, it has been reported to me they put in some \$16 nickel-plated, solid brass toilet paper holders. They are there because I saw them, and they are still there unless they have been removed recently. There are solid brass nickel-plated tooth brush holders in this installation in my district. It is time we get

down to rock bottom and stop that sort of thing because the taxpayers' money is going right out of the window.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman mentioned this matter to me and it was investigated. I have in my office evidence of the investigation. This is just good construction like American boys are entitled to, at permanent installations of this type. It was built firmly rather than of the type built in a theater of operations, it is good construction. Why should not American boys be entitled to reasonably good buildings, particularly when you can buy this cheaper than having something inferior? This is a good piece of construction in which the taxpayer gets his money's worth over a long period of years.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent granted, I insert at this point in the RECORD a summary of the construction at the base under discussion.

A STATEMENT OF THE TYPE OF AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AT WAVERLY, IOWA, A PERMANENT AIR FORCE INSTALLATION—GENERAL STATEMENT

Construction plans and specifications were prepared by Holabird and Root and Burgee, architect-engineers, Chicago, Ill., under direction of Office, Chief of Engineers. The district engineer was instructed to use plans and specifications without change, except to correct minor errors in definitives and to adjust as required for site adaptation. The operations building, tower building, radio stations, and central heating plant were designed for masonry construction only. The remainder of the buildings were designed for masonry construction with a wood frame alternate. This is typical practice for the A. C. & W. sites. At Waverly, bids were taken on a basic advertisement for concrete-block buildings throughout with an alternate bid for wood frame on the buildings where frame was permitted. Identical bids were received for both types of construction. Accordingly, the award was made for all masonry buildings.

BUILDING OUTLINE

Airmen barracks and officers quarters: Floors are soft wood with asphalt tile finishing with exception of heater room and mechanical room. Walls are concrete block, furred on inside and finished with gypsum board. Ceilings are gypsum board. The roof is wood frame with roll roofing. The hardware used is as follows: Butts are painted iron; push plates, where required, are bronze; pull plates, where required, are bronze; locks—working parts are bronze, case is painted iron; door knobs are bronze; door closers, where required, are painted iron. All of these items comply to the Federal specifications as outlined in the architect-engineer standard specifications for buildings. Based on a review of the as-built plans, it has been determined that toilet accessories—paper holders, towel racks, tooth brush and tumbler holders—comply with the Federal specifications, which provide for

polished unplated white metal fixtures. An exception by the district engineer gave the contractors the option to provide painted or plated white metal.

Mess hall: Floor is concrete slab on grade, no finish. Walls are concrete block, unfinished on the interior except for painting. Ceilings are acoustical tile in dining room, cement asphalt board in kitchen, and gypsum board in storage, toilet, and heater rooms. Roof is of wood frame construction surfaced with roll roofing. The information on hardware and toilet room accessories is the same as for quarters. Kitchen equipment, contractor furnished, consists of stainless steel serving counter, with built-in stainless steel components. The balance of kitchen equipment is standard. Office, Chief of Engineers centrally procured type.

Radio buildings: Floors are concrete slab on grade, finished with asphalt tile, except in boiler room and ventilating room which are exposed concrete. Walls are concrete block, unfinished inside except for painting. Ceiling, no finish. Roof is reinforced concrete with built up roofing. The hardware is the same as referenced above.

Supply, administration, and recreation building: The floor is soft wood with asphalt tile covering in the recreation and administration portions, and concrete slab on grade in supply room. Walls are concrete block, furred and finished with gypsum board in the recreation and administration portions and unfinished in the supply room. Ceiling is gypsum board in the recreation and administration areas and unfinished in the supply room. Roof is wood frame with roll roofing. Hardware same as before. Thresholds are cast iron and overhead door in the supply room is steel. Toilet room accessories same as referenced for airmen's barracks and officers' quarters.

Maintenance building: Floor, concrete slab on grade; walls, concrete block, no interior finish; ceilings, no finishing; roof, wood frame, roll roofing, hardware same as referenced above.

Operations building: Structure frame is reinforced concrete. Floor is concrete slab on grade with asphalt tile finish except in mechanical equipment rooms. Walls, concrete block, unfinished except for painting. Ceiling is unfinished except in certain operational sections—(operations, message center, teleprinter, briefing, triangulator and indicator—which have acoustical tile finish. Roof is reinforced concrete with built-up roofing. Hardware same as referenced above.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman made an investigation of this Air Force installation, he saw hundreds of dollars' worth of storm sashes, in a section of the country where zero and below zero weather is not unusual, that are practically worthless. If you made an investigation of the extravagances at this installation, whose fault is it?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say to the gentleman that I am not familiar with the

gentleman's installation; but the Committee on Armed Services did investigate very carefully the housing situation for which they asked an authorization running from \$1,900 to \$2,100 per man-unit. It seemed to us that you could not build palaces very well for that amount of money. The Navy wants \$1,900, the Air Force wants a little bit more. It is really about the same amount. Some have a little additional and some have a little less.

Mr. GROSS. I know what the gentleman is talking about. As I say, I spent nearly 3 years in the Army, beginning in 1916. In that time I was in only two barracks, once for 2 days at Brest, France, and again for a few days at Camp Devens, Mass., on my way out of the service. Somehow I seem to have lived through it. I am not advocating that troops live in tents today but certainly they do not need these plush hotel dormitory type barracks.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MAGEE. What did the gentleman say about the type of toilet-paper holders that were used?

Mr. GROSS. Solid brass nickel-plated at \$16 apiece.

Mr. MAGEE. The gentleman is from a State where the tall corn grows and I am afraid he is trying to make out a case for the Iowa corncob.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa is trying to make out a case for economy.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes, the last 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, whether or not the membership here is determined to vote for or against this amendment, some statements have been made that should be cleared up.

First of all, I do not think that any of you can rest your conscience, that if you vote for this amendment you had saved either \$80,000,000 that you talked about earlier, or the \$30,000,000 that is involved in this amendment. This is actually an increment on a large building program. This is a partial appropriation for a larger program that has been authorized. That money is going to be spent for housing either in a more compressed period of time or in a larger period of time. Do not kid yourself that because the Hardy committee said that so much money could be saved, by cutting that many dollars off of this bill you are going to save that money. It just does not work that way.

Now, there are many ways in which savings can be made. The statement

has been made that the Hardy committee report was not before the Committee on Appropriations; that members of our committee did not know that the Hardy committee said we could save \$80,000,000, and therefore the Committee on Appropriations did not take that into consideration. Well, what in the world have the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] and our committee staff headed by John Donnelly, been doing since last February if we did not take some of the things that we learned into consideration? Was all of that work wasted? If some of the statements that have been made here are true, then time has been wasted because we did not have before us the specific number of dollars that the Hardy committee said we could save. John Donnelly did not sit up day and night poring over the hearings of the Hardy committee just in order to save his conscience, I am sure of that. When you have a chance to study our subcommittee hearings, which have now been published, you will note that our committee has specifically pinned the Air Force down and told them there are two types of barracks, one recommended by the Strategic Air Command, and the other the standard Air Force type of barracks. Those are the things they will be permitted to build within the money appropriated for the building of barracks for these men. There has not been any publicity about some of these things that have been done; there has not been any headline on this particular work that has been done. Most of that has come from an investigating committee over in the other body that dropped the thing like a hot potato and left it to a clean-up committee in this body to actually transfer those newspaper headlines into terms of dollars and cents, and that is the position of our subcommittee this morning. And that clean-up job is reflected in dollar savings in the bill before us.

This appropriation, as I told the House yesterday, is a stop-gap thing as far as the Air Force is concerned. We have not been able to give it the attention that it ought to have because of the limitation of time, because of inadequate justifications, and the fact that the authorization bill was piled right smack on top of committee consideration of this appropriation. But, as I said, there are certain ground rules which this subcommittee has put into effect and which will be used by the Air Force; ground rules that will prevent some of these glaring things that the gentleman from Iowa and some of the others have called attention to.

Do not think for a minute that simply by lopping off a certain number of dollars you have saved that amount for the Treasury. It simply means that a lesser amount is going to be built during the course of this fiscal year, to be built at some later time.

I am not greatly concerned how you vote on this particular amendment. This \$30,000,000 is not going to make or break the Air Force housing program.

It probably will not affect it a great deal except by way of a possible delay, but I do not want a lot of people kidding themselves into thinking that voting for this amendment will save \$30,000,000, because that is not the fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to pursue the inquiry I made earlier of the chairman of the subcommittee and of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] with respect to the list of Air Force bases and other installations contained on pages 39 and 40 of the committee report, and to ask again if the numbering of the bases on this list is an indication that such bases and plants are to be considered in the order of their listing.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, my understanding is that that list is there, and they are numbered. On the other hand, the numbers mean nothing as to priority. It is up to the Air Force and their operations as to what they can do and when they should do it.

Mr. ELSTON. In other words, while the Barksdale Air Force Base is No. 1, but the Lockland plant near Cincinnati, Ohio, where they are making jet engines, is No. 126, it does not follow that the Barksdale Base will be taken up first and the Lockland plant when No. 126 is reached.

Mr. TABER. Not unless the Air Force decides that. They have given out no priority along that line.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Simply to confirm what the ranking minority member of the committee has stated, this list is in the report by way of limitation and not as a priority list. This list is submitted here only to make it clear that none of the money which has been outlined in various categories on pages 37 and 38 in the report is to be used on any installations of the Air Force not specifically listed on pages 39 and 40 of the bill.

Mr. ELSTON. Then the numbers do not mean anything?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They have no significance whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be defeated. This matter was thoroughly discussed in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and the Committee of the Whole saw fit at that time to defeat that.

I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that this investigating committee has studied this problem since last February and has gone into the plans and specifications of these buildings and eliminated anything of a plush nature, or anything of a gingerbread nature, or anything of a decorative nature. We are allowing to go into these plans and specifications only usable and wearable ar-

ticles. We are going to get a list from the services each month as to the money they have spent, the bases on which it is spent, and the increments for which it is spent.

In connection with this study, I am glad to report that the barracks today are costing in round figures \$400 per inmate less than they did a year ago. That is the result of the study and the simplification and the firming up of the plans of the barracks. We have cut this appropriation bill in accordance with the results of these studies.

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be defeated.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman realizes from all the information given to him that it is impossible even to let the contracts relating to about \$30 million of this amount during this present fiscal year.

Why should we not save a little money here with no harm whatever to our national defense? A little tightening up is not going to do the Air Force any harm whatsoever. My amendment is offered because of the fact that there was considerable support here for a far larger cut, \$80,000,000.

Mr. RILEY. We have already tightened this program up to the tune of cutting off half a billion dollars. I would not want to see another penny extracted from the appropriation for the Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be defeated, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 50, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the House owes a vote of thanks to the subcommittee on Military Construction headed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the other members being the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. They have been holding hearings almost constantly since the first day of February. The rest of the members of military appropriations came into these hearings after our other subcommittees had finished their work, largely on the procurement program.

I have, and our Nation should have, the greatest admiration for these men of ours in the Air Force who have, as always, done such a magnificent job of fighting in all corners of the world. They are the world's best. So that any of these remarks which have been made, or which will be made, which may be critical of some of the programs of the Air Force are not in the least bit critical of these men and the flying and fighting job that they have done and are doing.

It has been proved—and admitted by the top men in the Air Force—that in this program of construction, growing as rapidly as it has from the small force that we had up to the contemplated 143 group force, there has been a great deal of indecision, there has been some vacillation, and there have been many changes of plans, missions, and installations. This expansion should have had a logical, practical, cohesive progressive plan. However, I doubt there is an air base in the United States which has been contemplated in this program, which has not had anywhere from 6 to 50 changes on that base. In many instances the very mission of the base itself has been changed. A case in point is the air base at Grandview. We were told last year that due to the fact that Kansas City is centrally located with highways and railways and communications, it was the one best place in all the United States for headquarters of this Central Air Defense Command. Now we hear rumors that Grandview is not going to be used as headquarters for the Air Defense Command, but that the headquarters are going to be in Colorado Springs, that Grandview is only going to be the central district base, and that the Continental Air Command Headquarters is going to be moved from Mitchell Field to Grandview Air Base. In other words, the Air Force program is constantly changing. We do not know what it is to be tomorrow; they do not know. We are hoping that with the new chief of installations, named Thursday at noon, there will be a better and more comprehensive and more realistic and more common sense construction program, not only as to the mission of these air bases, but the construction that is to be thereon made. There have been many instances which have occurred in this construction program on which criticism is warranted. The matter of the barracks mentioned by the gentleman from Iowa has been under constant scrutiny by this subcommittee.

If the gentleman will read all of the hearings and the final report, he will find that the committee under Mr. Riley has made demands on the Air Force and on the Chief of Engineers of the Army for economy and common sense in construction. He will see that the barracks, which are to be built, will be in every way adequate, but that the so-called plush has been almost completely eliminated. I trust the gentleman will be much better pleased a year from now when the report is made as to the progress of this program so far as economy and realism is concerned. There are places where some things have been done, which this committee has pointed out to the Air Force should not be done, should be stopped, and those who are the perpetrators of the plans should be given the most severe punishment possible. For instance, one example is when under the guise of soil erosion work as shown by falsified work orders, the Air Force was building a 9-hole golf course. That has been stopped. The men who were responsible for this misuse of funds should be punished. There are many other things which must

be stopped. The Air Force must be economical. The Air Force must be realistic in these programs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have had a case where the Air Force kicked approximately \$100,000 out of the window by taking a low bid from a manufacturer in the State of Iowa, and the general who permitted that, and it was testified before a committee in the other body that they had made the mistake, that they had thrown nearly \$100,000 away, instead of being a 3-star to a 4-star general. Where is the punishment for these things?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know anything about that particular case, but I would request the gentleman to do this: I know the members of this military appropriations subcommittee. There is not a finer group of men in Congress. If you or any other Member of the House or the Senate find instances where there is anything wrong, or any waste, if you will let us know we will stop it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this chapter do now close.

Mr. BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I did want to say a word on housing. I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this chapter close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MEADER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment after section 804. I do not think it is controversial.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this chapter close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] for 3½ minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I really wanted 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request, the debate will close in 7 minutes. Under the division of time the gentleman is entitled to 3½ minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I really wanted 5 minutes with reference to housing. It is something that I have studied considerably.

Our Committee on Armed Services did not overlook the matter of housing. I think good housing is very essential to the armed services. We studied the types of barracks being planned and constructed in all the armed services. Each one of them will average about \$12 per square foot for all the services. In the Army the sizes will be from 105- to 225-men barracks.

I want to say to my distinguished friend from New York who took excep-

tion to my comment regarding housing in the armed services that I have taken this information from these reports, and I quote:

There are of course in existence many barracks inferior to those described (by me a moment ago). Some of them were built during the last World War. Some of them were built 20 to 30 years or more ago, and they were temporary barracks when they were built. With respect to all of these it can be said that they vary from virtually uninhabitable to reasonably usable, depending of course on the kind of original construction and the maintenance which had been performed during their lives.

I read that for the reason—and I speak advisedly—I have seen housing that is not habitable. It is not fit to be used. I am very glad the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has come in with an appropriation that will give our men in the uniformed services the type of housing they ought to have. It is not going to be luxury housing, and I do not think it should be. But the barracks including kitchen and dining facilities, in the Army will cost about \$2,100 per man. The Navy, on the other hand, will run around \$1,900 per man. There are some certain extras that will run it up over \$2,000. The Air Force will run roughly \$2,000 per man unit.

I mentioned these things because it shows you cannot get palace-like construction out of these figures.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Page 20, after line 10, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 805. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to expand the facilities of the Department of the Air Force to establish or maintain a separate system for providing such supplies and services as were furnished to the Department of the Air Force by the Department of the Army prior to August 1, 1951."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the same as one adopted by the House on April 9, 1952, with respect to the 1953 Defense appropriation bill. Its purpose is to prevent the Air Forces from setting up a duplicating third supply system for so-called common-use items.

I understand the Senate proposes to approach this same problem with a little different language but with the same objective in mind. The final language can probably be perfected in conference.

I have discussed the amendment with the leadership of the committee on both sides of the aisle. I understand it is agreeable to them.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. RILEY. The gentleman's amendment seems to be sound. We have no objection on this side; we will accept the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This is entirely consistent with the action the House took on the regular Defense Department appropriation bill.

Mr. MEADER. It is almost precisely the same language except it deals only with facilities, because the item in the bill deals only with public works of the Air Forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 21, line 6, strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following language: "Provided, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the funds herein made available shall be available for painting the exterior of the Jessie Lee Children's Home at Seward, Alaska."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER IX

MUTUAL SECURITY

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Government and relief in occupied areas

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government or occupation of certain foreign areas (except Germany, Japan and Austria), including, subject to such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition, travel expenses, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; translation rights, photographic work, education exhibits, and dissemination of information, including preview and review expenses incident thereto, hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; not to exceed \$2,000 for contingencies for the United States commanders, commissioners, or other administrators of foreign areas, to be expended in their respective discretions; such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; \$11,000,000, of which not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the general provisions of the Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year for the military functions of the Department of the Army shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as

amended, civil service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151-161): *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in such occupied areas in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and in the manner authorized by section 111 (b) (1) thereof: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of any area for which such funds are made available, may be expended by the President for the procurement of such commodities and technical services, and commodities procured from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the maintenance of the political and economic stability of such areas: *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made available, an agreement shall be entered into between the United States and the recognized government or authority with respect to such area containing such undertakings by such government or authority as the President may determine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided further*, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include requirements and undertakings corresponding to the requirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, approved December 17, 1947): *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay ocean transportation charges from United States ports, including territorial ports, to ports in the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such areas: *Provided further*, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals: *Provided further*, That the President may transfer to any other department or agency any function or functions provided for under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any such department or agency without reimbursement and without regard to the appropriation from which procured, such property as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,725,000 of the funds appropriated under this head for the fiscal year 1950, shall remain available until June 30, 1953, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed prior to July 1, 1950.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. Coudert], offered an amendment to the item contained on page 11 for the Tennessee Valley Authority. His amendment was to reduce the total amount \$150,000,000 to \$85,000,000. This amendment prevailed. Under the limitation of time that had been previously imposed, the committee did not have an opportunity to examine at that time the amendment in the light of the requirements of both the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission.

On yesterday, in a minute and a half, Mr. Coudert had this to say about his amendment:

Private power companies representing over a billion dollars in capital have offered to produce the power, and they have offered to produce it without expense to the United States.

The evidence will not support any such conclusion. Let us look at the facts and see what took place and what arrangements were made to furnish the required power to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Atomic Energy Commission needed 7,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy annually to carry on their operation. They set about to acquire this power from either the private utilities or the Tennessee Valley Authority. A group of five utility companies, jointly known as the Electric Energy, Inc., was invited by the AEC to submit a bid. Both TVA and the Electric Energy, Inc., were asked to submit their rates and bids for 25 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent and 100 percent of their power requirements. Both submitted their rates on the requested percentages and as a result of the examination of these rates it was decided that the TVA would be asked to produce 75 percent of the power and the Electric Energy, Inc., would be asked to produce 25 percent. This conclusion was warranted for many reasons as is well explained in the following letter which I received today from Mr. R. W. Cook, Director of Production, Atomic Energy Commission:

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., June 28, 1952.

Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, Jr.,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JONES: This is in response to your recent request concerning the power supply required for the proposed expansion program now before Congress and the steps taken and the reasoning which lead to the decision to obtain the additional power required for the proposed expansion of gaseous diffusion facilities at Paducah on a basis of 75 percent of the total requirement being obtained from TVA and 25 percent from Electric Energy, Inc., a group of five utilities.

As you know, under the present program, 50 percent of the total requirement at Paducah will be obtained from TVA and 50 percent will be obtained from EEI. The proposals received from TVA and EEI in December of 1950 for the present program were very competitive. At the time the present EEI contract was negotiated, the

estimated annual charges (TVA, \$14,922,000, and EEI, \$14,697,560) showed a possible difference in favor of EEI of \$224,000 per annum. Since that time escalation provided for in the EEI contract to reflect the increases in cost of construction of the facilities now indicates a difference in annual charges (EEI, \$15,252,000, and TVA, \$15,088,000) of \$164,000 per annum in favor of TVA.

The primary reason for this shift in relative positions lies in the fact that the EEI rate is escalated on the basis of actual construction costs of the facilities, while the TVA rate is escalated on the basis of the Engineering News Record cost index, a national index.

In obtaining the additional power required for the proposed expansion at Paducah, the Commission was in the fortunate position of being adjacent to two large power utility systems and deemed it in the Government's interest to seek proposals from both utilities, TVA and EEI, for 100 percent of the power, or such portions thereof in increments of 25 percent on which they wished to submit.

An analysis of the 100 percent proposals of TVA and EEI, based on cost to the AEC, on an annual charge based on 95 percent load factor, showed a material difference in favor of TVA. EEI was then given an opportunity to submit another proposal and, after many discussions during which it was pointed out that with certain changes we felt they could submit a more competitive proposal, a revised 100 percent proposal was submitted by EEI.

An analysis of the revised 100 percent EEI proposal with TVA, based on cost to the AEC on an annual charge based on 95 percent load factor, and 3½ percent financing, showed a difference in favor of TVA of \$2,673,000 or a total of \$66,825,000 over 25 years, the proposed term of the contract. (If EEI is required to pay 3¼ percent to obtain financing for the capital cost of the facilities, this would increase the per annum cost by \$290,000.)

As to income taxes paid by EEI, based on a guaranteed return of 8 percent, after taxes, on the equity capital they would furnish in the amount of \$8,500,000 out of a total estimated cost including working capital of \$222,500,000, their estimate of annual income-tax payments is \$603,000 or \$15,075,000 in 25 years. Thus the income taxes paid by EEI over a 25-year period would lack in offsetting by \$51,750,000 the saving to the AEC resulting from the TVA proposal.

The TVA proposal is on a commodity basis, with provisions for escalation of capital, fuel, and operating labor cost on formulae based on recognized indices, while the EEI proposal would result in a guaranty of costs and a guaranteed return of 8 percent after taxes on the equity capital they would furnish.

Also, the cost of the facilities to be constructed under the TVA or the EEI 100 percent proposal would be paid for by the Federal Government and in turn by the taxpayers. Under the EEI proposal it would be paid for over a 25-year period by the AEC and through the EEI charges for power and EEI would become the owners of a debt free plant in 25 years. Under the TVA proposal, the costs will similarly be paid for by AEC, and TVA, a Government agency, will become the owner of the plant.

You may be interested that in the TVA's 1951 Annual Report, for the years 1950 and 1951, the TVA reported net income, as computed under the Federal Power Commission's uniform system of accounts, of 5.8 and 5.4 percent, respectively. Considering the depreciation reserve as providing for the repayment of invested capital, the net income could be considered as being available for payment in lieu of interest or for return to

the Federal Treasury for the benefit of all taxpayers.

In reviewing the other alternatives, the cost per kilowatt hour under the TVA 75 percent proposal was less than their 100 percent proposal. EEI did not submit a 75 percent proposal. The cost per kilowatt hour under the TVA 50 percent proposal was considerably less than the EEI 50 percent proposal and the cost per kilowatt hour of the EEI 50 percent proposal was more than the EEI 100 percent proposal. Although the cost per kilowatt hour under the TVA 25 percent proposal was less than the EEI 25 percent proposal, it was felt that, since the Joppa plant, now under construction to serve 50 percent of the load under the present program was planned so that two additional generating units could be added, the addition of two units at the Joppa plant was adequate for 25 percent of the additional load and this should permit EEI to submit a proposal at a cost per kilowatt hour more nearly competitive with TVA. Subsequent discussions with EEI and a preliminary proposal for 25 percent indicated that a more competitive proposal could be obtained.

Further consideration indicated many advantages to the program by splitting the additional requirements, 75 percent TVA and 25 percent EEI. They are:

1. It provided two large utility systems from which to draw interim and back-up power supply, simplifying the problems on each system and increasing the dependability and reliability thereof. In addition, EEI under the 100 percent proposal was not able to fulfill all the requirements for the interim power required. Under this arrangement all requirements would be fulfilled.

2. The cost of the power during the construction period and the interim power required for the operation of the diffusion plant would be lower.

3. Access would be secured to a larger market for the absorption of any power released by a reduction in demand or termination of operations by the AEC. This would enable the Commission to negotiate more favorable cancellation provisions.

4. Additions to, and full completion of generating stations now under construction would reduce the reserves required and provide economies in construction cost, in use of critical materials, equipment, labor and in time required for completion.

5. This split would avoid the application of the higher coal cost escalator under the TVA 100 percent proposal.

6. An advantage is gained from the standpoint of dispersion.

7. It is sound from an engineering point of view.

In view of the above, it was decided that the split of 75 percent TVA and 25 percent EEI was most advantageous to the Government. Accordingly, TVA was assigned the responsibility to supply 75 percent of the additional power requirements and negotiations are now underway with EEI on the balance of 25 percent.

At Oak Ridge, which is well within the TVA power system, after discussions with adjacent public utilities on their interest to furnish the additional requirements for the proposed expansion program, and receipt of their reply that they did not feel they could submit proposals because the distance from their load centers to Oak Ridge was so great it was not economical because of transmission costs, the responsibility for supplying this additional power was assigned to TVA.

At the new gaseous diffusion plant, for which a site has not been selected, we expect to secure all the power requirements from private utilities and to that end are now negotiating with a group of 15 companies who have formed together and submitted a proposal for the total requirements.

If any additional information is desired please advise.

Yours very truly,

R. W. Cook,
Director of Production.

If TVA had furnished 100 percent of the power, their annual rate charges would have been approximately \$2,600,000 less than the rates offered by the Electric Energy, Inc. Or during the 25 years of the life of the contract a savings would have been made of approximately \$66,000,000.

Under the proposal which the subcommittee accepted and reported, however, TVA was asked to furnish 75 percent of the power. This annual saving in rate would be approximately \$2,000,000, and during the life of the contract it would amount to \$50,000,000. At the expiration of the 25-year period all plant facilities will be owned by the Federal Government. On the other hand, if the Coudert amendment prevails, at the end of the 25-year period the plant will be owned by the EEI and the Federal Government will have paid \$50,000,000 more in power rates than would be required by a contract with TVA.

What is this Coudert amendment? It is an amendment to require the taxpayers of this country, every year for 25 years, to pay a bonus of at least \$2,000,000 to a group of five private power companies whose representatives kept the telephones of this Capitol hot with their importunities all day yesterday. This is a case of a group of private utilities setting up a special corporation to get a contract from the Government to do for a handsome guaranteed fee and without any risk the job that an established agency of the Government itself can do as well at a huge savings to the taxpayers. This is an obvious effort to milk the taxpayers of more than \$2,000,000 a year. This is not economy. Let us have no nonsense about that. It is at least \$50,000,000 of outrageous extravagance.

The taxpayers provide the money for payment of the power bills of the Atomic Energy Commission. Each year they will pay an extra \$2,000,000 if the Coudert amendment is adopted. When AEC has paid for the EEI plant, the plant will belong to the power companies. I say that any Member of this House who supports this amendment shows a reckless disregard for the taxpayers' interest. I gave \$2,000,000 as the minimum additional amount which it will cost every year to have EEI do all the job instead of 25 percent as recommended by AEC. But \$50,000,000 is, in my judgment, likely to prove a gross underestimate of the proposed grab. While TVA has offered AEC a firm price subject only to adjustments for such factors as changes in the general level of construction costs while the plant is being built, and changes in the cost of fuel to operate it, EEI's proposal is, in fact, not a firm rate at all but merely a cost-plus-fee arrangement.

This amendment is willful extravagance. It goes against the judgment of the agency responsible for the AEC program. It goes against common sense and responds to the wishes of one of the

most greedy and ambitious lobbies this Congress has ever seen.

I am against the Coudert amendment and for the proposal recommended by the Atomic Energy Commission under which 75 percent of these power requirements will be provided by TVA.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does that take into consideration, which the evidence appears to show it does not, the tax situation as between the in lieu and actual taxes?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Let us get to that point now and I am glad the gentleman raises it. Under the tax arrangements and arrangements of the contract entered into by the companies and AEC, the Electric Energy, Inc., would pay \$150,000 annually in income taxes. So that means that the Federal Government by executing that contract on a 100 percent basis with EEI would receive \$603,000 a year in income taxes. If the Atomic Energy Commission executes the contract with TVA we save \$2,600,000. It is simple arithmetic. Which is greater, \$603,000 or \$2,600,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

(On request of Mr. COOPER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JONES of Alabama was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the amendment offered yesterday reducing this appropriation by \$65,000,000 came up at an unfortunate time when there was very little time left, approximately 2½ or 3 minutes, for debate. It was impossible to adequately and properly discuss and cover it in that length of time. The gentleman from Alabama has made an outstanding argument as to why the action taken by the Committee of the Whole on yesterday, when we get into the House, should not be rejected. Not only because of the able argument of the gentleman, but from the angle of national defense, this is vitally important to the security of our country with reference to the production of atomic energy and all that goes with it. I join with my friend and others in urging that when we get into the House that we reject the amendment and permit the appropriation recommended by the Committee on Appropriations to be adopted by the House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman. To go a little bit further in emphasizing what the gentleman from Massachusetts has stated, one of the advantages of acquiring energy from the Tennessee Valley Authority is that they will have interim power available where the Atomic Energy Commission can proceed without delay. If we have to delay until such time that we will have full production and full capacity of the generating units to be constructed by the private power companies, then we will lose time. The Coudert proposal comes rather late, and it is unfortunate that the private utility companies have come up and started a campaign without presenting all of the facts.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Is it true that in this letter from the Atomic Energy Commission, which the gentleman will insert in the RECORD when we go back in the House, it is stated that the Atomic Energy Commission asked the private-utility companies to make the expansion power available for Oak Ridge, and that they refused?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The surplus energy needed to supplement the power already going to Oak Ridge will not be available from private utilities, because they refused, and they refused on the ground that they could not generate and transmit electricity that great a distance at a rate which the Federal Government could afford to pay.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that the question of the policy with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority was settled years ago, and that it is not involved here? None of this power is for the people of that area or that section. All of the power sought to be produced here is for atomic energy, and for that alone, and it is vital and necessary to have this power for the production of atomic energy, and this is the only source from which that necessary power can be secured.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Tennessee is absolutely correct. Not only that, but the Tennessee Valley Authority did not propose that they construct these generating units. That proposal came from the AEC, and they were charged with the responsibility of obtaining power at the lowest possible cost. Now, when they come up with a proposition of saving the taxpayers \$2,000,000, there is something sinister and wrong in that. I do not know what sins can be committed in the name of private enterprise, but certainly this is one, because factually you cannot sustain any other conclusion. I think we will all agree that one of the most important topics of discussion that comes from this well is saving the taxpayers' money. If you believe that the Federal Government should be frugal and make wise and sound investments, you cannot under any circumstances or conditions justify the support for striking out the ability of the Tennessee Valley Authority to produce this energy.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in my considered judgment the committee on yesterday made a most serious mistake in adopting the Coudert amendment. I shall discuss this matter from a nonpartisan standpoint and a factual standpoint. There are those in this House on both sides of the aisle, who, when the name of the Tennessee Valley Authority comes up, react just the same as if you waved a red flag in the face of a bull. That is unfortunate. The United States has over a billion dollars invested in TVA. But let us

not go too far along that line. Listen to the committee report. It may be some of you have not read it:

The bill includes the budget estimate of \$150,000,000 to provide funds for commencing construction of steam electrical generating plants, transmission lines and other facilities necessary to provide power for the expansion program of the Atomic Energy Commission. The two programs go hand in hand and one is useless without the other. The program provides for the construction of 10 additional or new generating units with a rated capacity of 1,710,000 kilowatts. The total estimated cost of the program is \$305,000,000.

I asked the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] if it was not true that in a letter from the general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission it was stated that the Atomic Energy Commission asked private utilities to build a steam plant to furnish this extra power at Oak Ridge. He stated, "Yes." I saw it in the letter. The private utilities refused. You can see why they refused.

In the first place, TVA has all the customers. We hope and pray that this war will not last forever. A private utility would be silly if they built a plant right in the middle of TVA when TVA has all the customers, and there would no longer be any use for it after 5 or 6 years because surely the emergency will be over in that time.

This is what it boils down to. This is no fight on TVA. When you vote this \$65,000,000 cut, it means that if you want atom bombs, replace that \$65,000,000. If you do not want atom bombs, cut it out. This will delay the program about 1 year, or make it that much longer.

The Kingston plant, which is located only 10 miles from Oak Ridge, is the one that gets two new units. This same bill carries an appropriation of almost \$500,000,000 to expand the Atomic Energy plants at Oak Ridge. You know that Oak Ridge is the place that produces the atom bombs. They must have this additional electricity at Oak Ridge. It carries the steam plant at Rogersville, Tenn., two new units at Kingston, Tenn., which is Oak Ridge itself, for it is joined together, and at Gallatin, Tenn., for the Paducah, Ky., plant. Not one kilowatt hour of that goes to us Tennessee backwoodsmen. It goes into the producing not only of atom bombs but what they call a family of atom weapons. I think even New York, as close as it is to the eastern seaboard, needs the protection of atom bombs and atom weapons to be produced at this great plant at Oak Ridge. So you are not fighting TVA when you cut this \$65 million out. You are fighting the production of atomic bombs. Nobody can deny that. Not one penny of it goes to burn our electric lights in our houses or to furnish what the people from New England, with all due respect to them, seem to think Tennessee has gotten too much of. What has Tennessee gotten out of it? I might say this, without digressing in the least, I do wish many Members of my party, and I am a Member of the party to which the gentleman belongs who offered the amendment, would come to Tennessee and visit us. Come down there and see

what we are like. It would seem that we must be a different kind of people according to the way we have been pictured by the New England folks. You will find in Tennessee the same kind of people as you will find in New England, but just because the TVA is there, they would take out a rapier or a pearl-handled dagger and reach in and cut out \$65,000,000. It is wrong. It is fundamentally unsound. Suppose this great plant at Oak Ridge was in the Sahara Desert. It would not make any difference. Tennessee would get the same benefit out of it as it does now.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my intention is not to engage in a lengthy argument over the merits or demerits of this case, but to bring certain facts before the committee. If it were suggested that this would be an excellent opportunity for a thorough investigation of the TVA situation, I for one would be very much in accord with it. Yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] offered an amendment which reduced by a certain sum the amount of money to be provided to the TVA for the construction of steam plants. I thought it was a good amendment at the time, and I voted for it. I still think it is a good amendment. I think some of the things that have been discussed today could bear a little further comment, and as I said before, they might well be investigated. I recall several years ago, we argued loud and long on the floor and in the corridors over whether or not we should build one steam plant in the TVA area for the purpose of firming up the electric current which was then being provided by the hydroelectric facilities, which we had favored and voted for. When this program is finished, Mr. Chairman, 62 percent of the power developed in the TVA will be developed by steam plants, an excellent example of the camel's head under the tent, and shortly the body following the head. It is said here on the floor that the AEC urged, or perhaps compelled the TVA to build these additional plants. The testimony does not quite support that statement. Those plants are now outside the territory of the TVA, the originally established territory of the TVA. I am going to say frankly, they are not very much outside; they are 10 to 15 miles out of it, but nevertheless that is another case of the camel's head, which I think might be looked into. The point I would like to make is that the AEC did not really force the TVA because the AEC asked for bids from both private industry and the TVA. I do not have the letter, but the gentleman from New York yesterday showed me a letter which indicated that the private companies were willing to supply these facilities, and to build the facilities at their own expense, and that the difference in the annual cost for current was what the gentleman from Alabama indicated, approximately \$2,500,000 a year. But, Mr. Chairman, when they set that figure the TVA did not include interest, so far as I can determine. That did not include

depreciation which the ordinary company would take. That did not include taxes on the same basis which private utilities would pay taxes.

Mr. Chairman, if we continue squeezing out all the taxpaying industries in the United States, who is going to pay the taxes to run this expensive Government?

I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Let me read to you a portion of a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Can you do it quickly? I have a couple of other points I would like to make.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. As to income taxes paid by EEI, based on a guaranteed return of 8 percent, after taxes, on the equity capital they would furnish in the amount of \$8,500,000 out of a total estimated cost including working capital of \$222,500,000, their estimate of annual income tax payments is \$603,000 or \$15,075,000 in 25 years. Thus the income taxes paid by EEI over a 25-year period would lack in offsetting by \$51,750,000 the saving to the AEC resulting from the TVA proposal.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I cannot yield further, because I want to say that if the gentleman from Alabama is agreeing with me that this is something which requires a complete investigation, I would be glad to go along with him. When these plants are built and used for the atomic-energy program, then nobody knows now what the power will be used for when the atomic-energy program lets down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of foreign military and economic aid is to help make strong those nations allied with us in the current world struggle for survival against the forces of Communist aggression.

During the debate on this bill there has been testimony that such aid since World War II has reached the \$40,000,000,000 mark. Yet, today 560,000 soldiers of the Nationalist Government of the Republic of China now on Formosa and anxious to fight on our side, are without shoes.

This is the largest Asiatic anti-Communist Army.

Commenting on military assistance for this particular area in the very bill now before us, the report presented by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] states:

There is no other area of the world where the immediate need for military strength to ward off communism is more apparent.

And the bill provides for \$540,000,000 for material and training in the general area of China including the troops on Formosa who today are on maneuvers without shoes.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and I saw the crack Sixty-seventh

Division of the Chinese Nationalist troops drill in the hills near Taipeh 2 months ago. These, the best fitted of all the Chinese troops, wore old sneakers or tennis shoes as they marched in the mud and muck and fought mock battles.

The picture disturbed Admiral Radford who inspected these troops on Formosa shortly after our visit and just a few days ago the admiral reported to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the inadequate trickle of equipment being sent to the island should be quickly augmented.

Forty billion dollars in foreign military and economic aid since World War II but no shoes for this Asiatic anti-Communist Army!

Ask any infantryman what a good pair of army field shoes means to health, morale, and efficiency.

General Chase, who now heads the American mission of 400 officers training this friendly Chinese Army on Formosa, is at a loss to understand why we are neglecting to do more for an army which, when the chips are really down, as his men put it, may mean the difference between victory or failure in this life-and-death struggle.

And General Chase adds another clincher to his argument we should be beware of a slow boat to the Chinese on Formosa and fail to appraise realistically their possibilities. He points out that it costs only \$300 to sustain a Chinese Nationalist soldier on Formosa for 1 year. The Pentagon tells me that the yearly cost to sustain an American GI runs close to \$6,000. There is congressional testimony the figure is considerably higher.

I have referred to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] who saw these shoeless soldiers with me on Formosa and I feel certain that he as chairman of the committee reporting this aid bill aims to do what he can to have this deficiency corrected. I ask him if he has a word of comment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that the Chinese soldiers do need equipment. The one word that we heard more on Formosa than any other was "hardware"; that they needed "hardware" for the troops.

It is also true that they need shoes. I never saw a pair of leather shoes on a single Chinese soldier.

I am inclined to believe that if the Chinese are properly equipped they will make good soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CANFIELD was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. GARY. The gentleman will remember that on Korea we were told that the Korean troops now are among the best in the line. When we called attention to the poor showing that they made at the beginning of the struggle we were told by the officers from General Van Fleet right down the line that it was because at that time they were not adequately trained and equipped. But now since they have been properly trained and properly equipped they are

giving an excellent account of themselves. I think the same thing would be true of the Chinese soldiers.

We are providing materials and equipment for them in this bill, and I trust that we shall continue to do so, because I think they are a very vital factor in our defense against Communism in that section of the world.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am glad the gentleman from Virginia made that statement; I think it is going to give real heart to those troops on Formosa who are on our side in this world conflict.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin who is so well informed on the world struggle and its dangerous portents.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey on pointing this out because, as he said, here we have one of the greatest potential anti-Communist forces in the world, particularly in Asia. We should center our attention on properly equipping them. The failure of the administration to give the green light to the Chinese Nationalist forces in Asia is one of the great tragedies of our time. A new Republican administration will base its foreign policy on liberation instead of containment and will aid these anti-Communist Chinese forces to free China and deliver the death blow to Communism in Asia.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for a minute or two on the question that has now arisen regarding the amendment which was adopted yesterday to reduce the TVA authority by \$65,000,000.

I have information from very reliable sources that since the Coudert amendment to the bill was adopted when the authorization bill was before the House recently striking out two steam plants in the TVA area, the private utilities which surround the TVA area have now made plans and are ready to build all the necessary facilities, not only generating plants but transmission lines to furnish the atomic-energy plant with all the power they can use or want. Because of that I can see no reason why the taxpayers of America should be burdened with another \$65,000,000. The private utility companies which surround TVA joined together during World War II to pool their power for the defense effort. They are still doing so. They are good Americans and certainly they would not do anything that would in the least hinder the production of the atomic bomb.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Do these private utilities offer to take any risk at all in their proposal? As I understand their offer, it is proposed that they will invest a certain amount of money after having obtained loans guaranteed by the Federal Government, and they want a 25-year contract from the Atomic Energy Com-

mission under the terms of which they will be guaranteed an 8-percent return on equity capital, after taxes, during the 25-year period plus an amortization of their entire investment within 25 years. At the end of 25 years, after having received these benefits, the entire plant would belong to them; is that correct?

Mr. JENSEN. Not quite.

Mr. YATES. What is their proposal?

Mr. JENSEN. I have no information to that effect.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have a copy of the letter to which the gentleman is referring and to which the gentleman from New York made reference yesterday, and I find nothing in it to support the query of the gentleman from Illinois. I think it is a straightforward proposition to provide 1,296,000 kilowatts.

Now there is another point involved in the question of these plants. The TVA figures its rates on the cost of current, which include the cost of the plants. Suppose it was discovered that the plant cost more than the TVA had expected when it made its rates. Would the TVA raise its cost to the consumer as a private utility would have to do to survive, or would the taxpayers be called upon to pay the difference?

Mr. JENSEN. It is the same old story. It is subsidized power, and the American taxpayers pay the difference in the final analysis for all these subsidized programs.

Mr. YATES. May I invite the attention of the gentleman from California to the fact that the utilities, the private group that is proposing to supply the power to site X, requested cancellation costs of \$220,000,000 from the Atomic Energy Commission?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(On request of Mr. YATES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JENSEN was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. YATES. They asked that the Government allow cancellation costs up to about \$220,000,000 on a proposed investment by the private group of \$400,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, they must have some kind of assurance to justify spending their shareholders' dollars. This is a temporary deal.

Mr. YATES. I will ask the gentleman from California whether that is not the fact. He was at the hearing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It was fifty-seven million for an actual power cancellation cost.

Mr. YATES. That is only partly true. AEC contemplates receiving power for its expanded program from three sources. There were three cancellation costs—the TVA asked for a cancellation allowance of \$28,000,000; EEI, a private group, a cancellation allowance of \$28,000,000; and the third group a cancellation allowance of \$220,000,000, thus making up total cancellation costs of \$277,000,000 requested by AEC of our

subcommittee. That was the reason I presented my amendment yesterday to limit cancellation costs of \$57,000,000, because we did not know what the cancellation costs would ultimately be with respect to the third group, and because the subcommittee believed cancellation costs of \$220,000,000 were excessive in view of the proposed \$400,000,000 investment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that is the figure we should take—\$57,000,000.

Mr. YATES. That is the figure the House did take. The gentleman knows and our hearings show that the Atomic Energy Commission came before our subcommittee and asked that it be allowed the sum of \$220,000,000 for the purpose of building a generating plant of its own or setting aside that sum of money in a reserve to be used for cancellation costs in the event it entered into contracts with the private utilities to furnish power at site X. Is that not correct? Is that not correct, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, but there would be an equal cost if it were a Government-operated plant, and it stopped suddenly. The TVA would then have a loss itself equivalent to the cancellation clause loss.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman on that point. That is the reason the TVA asked for a cancellation clause because it takes the position that its operation should be conducted the same as a private utility. But, the fact remains, nevertheless, that the private group which proposed to furnish power at site X, wanted a clause which would permit payment of possible \$220,000,000 cancellation costs. I agree with the gentleman that our subcommittee should carefully supervise what is going on to see that the taxpayers are protected. As I understand the proposal of the private companies to furnish power, it would offer so much protection to the investors as to eliminate all risk and amount to a gift of utility facilities by the Government those steam plants which they have removed.

Mr. JENSEN. The simple facts of the case are that if the Government builds quested, you can bet your life that over a period of years it will cost the taxpayers of America many times more than any contract that the Government would sign with private industry to furnish and transmit this power. That is one thing sure, because we have had examples of that all over the country in the past.

Mr. YATES. I do not oppose the principle of private companies furnishing the power for the project. I believe that the private companies should be given the opportunity to furnish the power, but not at the terms or under the conditions that have been proposed in the offer that has been made, because such terms and conditions are unfair. We should not permit the group of utility companies to take undue advantage of the Government, to make suckers out of the taxpayers, by using the cry of private enterprise. The term "private enterprise" presupposes the taking of a risk of some kind. In this offer of the private com-

panies, there is no risk involved at all to the investors.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on title I close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—MUTUAL SECURITY

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, approved October 10, 1951), as amended, as follows:

Military assistance, title I: For assistance authorized by section 101 (a) (1), \$3,273,824,750; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 101 (a) (1) of said act shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation.

(Mr. BAKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: On page 25, line 25, strike out "\$3,273,824,750" and insert "\$3,128,224,750."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the committee during the last 2 or 3 days of its consideration of the bill developed what I think is very important and interesting information as to what is known as part 2 of the hearings. This \$145,600,000 which I offer the amendment here to eliminate is part of \$208,000,000 of which I could call water in this bill.

On the last day of the hearings the committee was shocked to learn of some high and fancy juggling of the figures that proved conclusively that the obligations of the agency for military purposes were plugged to the tune of \$408,000,000.

The subcommittee took \$200,000,000 of that out, leaving in \$208,000,000, made up of this \$145,600,000, \$31,200,000 in title II, \$24,960,000 in title III, and \$6,240,000 in title IV. I understand additional amendments will be offered on the last-mentioned three items. This amendment, along with the others, seek to recapture the \$208,000,000 that has been hidden by this agency, whether by accident or design. It is now learned that they have \$408,000,000 more than they thought the agency had. This suggested amendment puts back to the Treasury \$145,600,000 of the \$208,000,000. The Mutual Security Agency came before the committee with a budget request among other things asking for authority to continue unobligated balances available after June 30, 1952. Owing to the schedule, which was submitted, it shows an estimated, unobligated balance of \$398,045,000. In this part 2 of the hearings, the unobligated balance as of June 30, 1952, is shown as \$658,000,000 instead of \$398,000,000. So here are \$270,000,000 which has been developed as a result

of the hearings toward the end. During the course of the hearings, certain tables were requested showing obligations by months. Someone a few moments ago stated that other additional schedules would be requested for month-to-month schedules showing all of the expenditures that would be made, in other words setting up a kind of watch-dog performance on this whole operation with respect to housing for the Air Force. I congratulate the committee for asking for those schedules from time to time because as a result of those requests, it is developed that there is still \$208,000,000 in this which we should take out.

Mr. Foster, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, came before the committee and admitted without qualification that these unobligated balances were understated by \$270,000,000, being the difference between the \$398,000,000 originally submitted in the schedule submitted early, and the \$668,000,000 which shows in other parts of the testimony. In addition, Mr. Foster admitted considerable doubt about another item of \$357,000,000. This particular item is still not explained after three different stories have been received as to the detail of what is supposed to have been furnished for the \$219,000,000. The difference cannot be explained. Hence for the purpose of this amendment, the difference between \$357,000,000 and \$219,000,000, for which the detail has been furnished, is considered to be excess funds. This \$138,000,000, which added to the \$270,000,000 previously admitted, gives a total of \$408,000,000 of which \$200,000,000 has been deducted in the committee and \$208,000,000 of extra velvet is sought in this particular amendment plus the three amendments which will be offered.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a single appropriation, in my judgment, that has ever been before this body that has been more carefully considered than the one you have before you at the present time.

Let me remind you of the fact that when the first request was submitted to the Congress in the authorization bill it amounted to \$7,900,000,000. The House cut that amount very substantially, and let me say here I think very properly. It went to the Senate and there, after very careful deliberation, another amount was fixed. Then the bill went to conference, and the conferees finally agreed upon an authorization of \$6,400,000,000, a cut of \$1,500,000,000 from the bill.

Since the bill had been so carefully considered by both Houses of the Congress our committee felt that it determine the policy of the Congress on the subject, but that it was our duty to investigate and to ascertain if there were any items that could properly be cut without impairing the program and at the same time carry out the policy which the Congress had laid down in the authorizing legislation.

Our staff did a remarkable piece of work on this bill. They explored un-

obligated balances. Let me say the work they did on this bill, to my mind, is an answer to a bill that is coming on the floor next Wednesday to create some super joint committee for such investigations. We have investigators in the Appropriations Committee. They are doing an excellent job, and there is no need, in my judgment, for another committee to investigate appropriations in addition to the Appropriations Committee. It is merely an effort to impose one investigator upon another.

We did discover, as the gentleman has just stated, that the original estimates of the Department of Defense showed unobligated balances of \$398,000,000. Our investigations disclosed that, instead of \$398,000,000, the present estimate of unobligated balances is \$669,000,000. Our committee felt that we could very properly, under those circumstances, make further reductions in the amounts allowed for military assistance, and we have taken off \$200,000,000 in addition to the amount that was stricken from the original authorization bill.

In addition, there is an item in the bill of \$45,000,000 for assistance in Korea. The organization that will administer that assistance will not begin to operate until 6 months after cessation of hostilities. No one knows when hostilities will cease, but if they were to cease today they could not begin operations for 6 months. They have a balance of \$40,000,000 which would enable them to operate for the balance of the fiscal year. Therefore, our committee felt there was no necessity for any further appropriation insofar as Korea is concerned.

In addition to that we struck out \$1,820,000 in government and relief in occupied areas, which covers Japan and the Ryukyus.

In addition to that we struck out \$1,500,000 for government of occupied areas, which covers Germany, Austria, and Trieste.

We reduced the administrative expenditures \$1,800,000. This item already had been very substantially reduced in the authorization bill by the Ribicoff amendment which required a 5-percent reduction in personnel.

Our committee has recommended a reduction in the entire bill of \$250,120,000 below the amount finally agreed upon in the authorizing legislation. I feel very earnestly that this is all the cuts this bill can stand without impairing the program which it contemplates. Therefore I ask the House to sustain the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(On request of Mr. CRAWFORD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GARY was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 9 of part 2 of the hearings Mr. Foster and his assistant set up the figure of \$1,714,000,000 for June obligations; yet on the 18th of June they had \$668,000,000 of that still left; that would be \$668,000,000 left to

be spent in some twelve days. As the gentleman says, his committee took off \$200,000,000. I congratulate the committee for doing that, but why did you not take off the other \$208,000,000 which the figures would justify? That is the only question I am raising here.

Mr. GARY. Frankly, there were many doubts about those figures. There was some evidence that the authorizations were not firm authorizations but that the authorizations had been entered into. The Department of Defense admitted that the unobligated balance would be \$669,000,000, but insisted that all funds beyond that would be obligated before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the \$668,000,000?

Mr. GARY. No; it is \$669,000,000 instead of \$668,000,000; that the \$669,000,000 would be unobligated. That makes a difference of \$270,000,000. We took off \$200,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think if the gentleman will review the figures closely he will find that the total not justified was \$408,000,000.

Mr. GARY. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not imagining these figures; they are right here before me.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman's figures are based upon our investigations. The amounts may be somewhat larger, but based upon the testimony of the Defense Department \$669,000,000 is the proper figure.

[Mr. SIEMINSKI addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have three other amendments based on the same thing totaling around \$200,000,000.

Mr. GARY. I said this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate that, but there are three amendments to be offered, based on the same argument, and I think it would be perhaps better to argue the first amendment, then the other three would more or less follow in line.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amendment. I congratulate the subcommittee on the work it has done in its investigation of unobli-

gated and unexpended balances, and I think this cut is certainly justified, based on the amazing gyrations in departmental estimates revealed by their report. These discrepancies are the result either of miscalculations by the departments or their attempt to make us miscalculate on unobligated and unexpended balances.

I arrived at the amount of \$209,000,000 that might safely be cut by a somewhat more circuitous route. I had understood that there were discovered \$809,000,000 of unobligated funds through the diligent work of the staff and the interrogations of the Members of the subcommittee. I took the \$200,000,000 reduction made by the committee in this bill and then I allowed the \$250,000,000 now said to be needed for obligations, and then I took out an amount for infrastructure, because if this was cut out of the military bases authorization that this House voted recently, and I came up with \$209,000,000 more reduction than this bill could stand, because of money that the departments had not obligated or spent and did not say they needed to obligate or spend. However, a more simple way is the way the gentleman from Michigan has figured, and he comes to \$208,000,000. Here was what was presented to our committee only a few short weeks ago; they said that they were going to have \$400,000,000 left over unobligated at the end of the year but that they needed \$200,000,000 in small change lying around to obligate according to emergencies that might arise. Now we find that the amount in this one part of the bill, in the military end, is going to be not \$400,000,000 but \$669,000,000 unobligated, unexpended. They have hiked the amount that they want to carry in the petty cash drawer for later obligations and expenditures that they cannot make up their minds on now, they have hiked that amount by \$50,000,000, or maybe \$100,000,000. Well, it seems to me in view of that kind of estimate and that kind of arithmetic we are justified in making this reduction at this point in the bill. I would prefer to have it taken off of the economic aid for Europe and cut that down more to the size that it was when the authorization ceiling left this chamber but I realize that in view of the transfer authorization given, and I think properly given, in the authorization act and not disturbed in the present bill, it does not make so much difference which part of this bill you cut down in making some modest corrections to bring the appropriation facts of life in accord with what these departments have said. Remember, there is an admitted difference of \$269,000,000 between the amount they told our committee they were going to obligate and the information pulled out of them with a cork screw by the able staff of this subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to use this time to ask the

chairman of the committee a question or two in regard to some queries that have arisen from people in the boat-building industry out on the Pacific coast, whether or not any of the funds appropriated in this title for military purposes are to be used for the building abroad, in foreign shipyards, of vessels for the account of and use of the American Navy?

Mr. McGRATH. In answer to the distinguished gentleman—I know of his deep interest in an industry like this—in the bill there is approximately a billion dollars for off-shore procurement, some of which is for ships.

Mr. SHELLEY. I do not know whether that completely answers my question. I will tell the facts of the case as they have come to me and see if that will enable the committee to enlighten me on the situation.

On the Pacific coast the boat-building industry has been very severely hit partly because of the tendency to grant contracts to the east coast, and partly because of the application of the manpower policy No. 4, of taking the work from the west coast and removing it to the eastern area on the theory that they are distressed employment areas. Some of the people on the Pacific coast have acquired the thought that some of this money is being used to build vessels in foreign shipyards for the use of the American Navy. I made some inquiry of the Navy Department, and they tell me there are vessels being built by these funds, that they are being built in Holland, Italy, France, and the Scandinavian countries for the use of those navies, to be manned by their nationals and to be sailed under their flags as part of the North Atlantic combined fleet. But I want to check with the committee to see whether or not that is the answer.

Mr. McGRATH. We are not building in foreign shipyards any ships for our own Navy. They are, however, building for the foreign governments themselves.

Mr. SHELLEY. Is it a fact that in return for this financial aid we make the requirement that these countries in return must make these ships available for use with the combined fleet under the North Atlantic Treaty? And further that no part of these funds will be used for building vessels for ourselves in foreign yards?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this kind of measure is the sort of measure that you cannot be just halfway for and halfway against. You either believe in the principle of collective or mutual security, or you do not. I think you ought to vote accordingly. Either vote the full amount, or vote to cut it out completely.

I wonder if the Members of this House who are proposing further cuts in the mutual security bill fully understand the nature and purpose of the bill and what an adequate appropriation will accomplish. Many of us have been so busy with the great volume of complicated

legislation we have had to consider that we cannot all be experts on each piece of legislation. I think I can qualify as one who understands this bill and therefore it may be helpful if I attempt to show you as clearly as I can its essential features.

Do you realize that this is both a defense bill and an economy bill?

It is a defense bill because the money contained in it will make it possible for our allies to place under arms many well-equipped divisions to defend our common interests, which otherwise they would be unable to put into the field.

It is an economy bill because not the United States but these allies of ours will be bearing the great part of the costs of raising, training, and equipping their divisions. Testimony has shown that a United States division fully equipped costs the United States about \$480,000,000; a European division costs about \$280,000,000 in total; the equipment we provide under this program for a European division costs the United States \$133,000,000 because our allies supply the balance of the costs as well as the men. They supply about one-half of the weapons and all of the costs of raising, training, feeding, and supplying their soldiers with shoes, clothing, and all the other things that are required to build a military establishment.

I do not understand how any Member of this House can really believe he is economizing if he votes to cut an appropriation which supplies only the margin needed by our allies to build up their own military forces.

Let me put the economy aspects of this bill in another way. Testimony has indicated that in the coming year it will cost the United States in expenditures about \$55,000,000,000 for our own Armed Forces; the amount originally requested for the mutual-security program in Western Europe was about \$5,500,000,000, or roughly one-tenth of the amount estimated for our own military expenditures. Yet for approximately one-tenth of the cost of our domestic Military Establishment we were to have acquired actually more men in the armies of our western European allies under arms or readily mobilizable than the total of our own Army. The amount requested from the Congress for the purpose of assistance to Western Europe has already been cut to about \$4,500,000,000, and I assert with all the emphasis at my command that we do not dare to cut this figure any further.

So far I have been talking about dollars and cents and men under arms. This is by no means the whole story, however. Anyone looking back over the record in Western Europe since the war if he is at all fair minded must admit the tremendous accomplishments since that time. Not only has Western Europe with our assistance recovered from the economic prostration and despair which followed the destruction of the war, but great strides have been made toward building the military and psychological strength of the nations of this area. These nations have banded together with us in the North Atlantic Treaty, they have steadily built up the size and

efficiency of their armed forces, and this trend toward economic, military, and spiritual strength is increasing its pace. Furthermore, there have been great strides toward real unification in this area. The Schuman plan has just been ratified by all the Parliaments and is about to go into effect; the European Defense Community has been agreed to and is expected to be ratified this year; agreements have been completed to bring Western Germany into the European Community and to make use of its tremendous resources in the defense of the free world. All this could never have been accomplished without both the help and leadership of the United States on the one hand and the courage and devotion to the ideals of freedom of our allies on the other hand. The tide is running strongly in our favor. Is this the time to slacken our efforts and to announce that we are flagging and hesitating in our leadership and support?

I am sure that any man who really thinks about these issues cannot possibly come to the conclusion that it would be in the interest of our own defense or of economy in this country to slash this appropriation further. Such action would cost us money rather than save us money and would mean less defense against Soviet imperialism than we otherwise could obtain. It would mean also that if trouble should come our own boys would be deprived of strong allies and would have to bear a much larger part of the burden of defense than necessary. It would be our own boys who would do most of the fighting and suffer most of the casualties. Furthermore, unless we have strong allies it would be much more likely in case of war that fighting would take place on our own shores than in areas far removed from our country.

Let no man think that he is serving the interests of the United States if he votes to slash the appropriation in this bill below the already deeply cut amount which is now before the House.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. REES of Kansas, the time allotted to him was given to Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let us make this very clear. This is not any cut in appropriations. It is actually a miscalculation on the part of the various people concerned with this program. It is almost a matter of arithmetic. That is putting the thing on as friendly a basis as one can put it, assuming that they did not deliberately come in and try to get the Congress to appropriate \$408,000,000, which they admit their calculations to be. I think that is what we ought to direct our attention to. First of all, I compliment this subcommittee and its staff for a real follow-

through job. In other words, frequently committees in the House have been content to have the original presentation of the departments concerned with these programs given to them in general terms, and then let it sit, and we here in Congress have to rely on it. This subcommittee did not do just that. This subcommittee went further and brought these same people back before them. I think everyone in this House should take a look at, and, in fact, keep in their files, the report of the supplementary hearings before the subcommittee, part two, on the Mutual Security Appropriation for 1953. Incidentally, the date of this report is Tuesday, June 24, 1952; in other words, just Tuesday of this week, just a few days ago. You read those hearings and draw your conclusions from this very interesting presentation, and you will find that the departments admit that they miscalculated to the tune of \$408,000,000. Now, the committee has gone ahead and cut off \$200,000,000, but it seems to me the smart thing is, where they have made an error in arithmetic, that they should not be allowed to keep the additional \$208,000,000. This first amendment is to cut that off pro rata. I will then offer an amendment which will cut the other pro rata off. There will be two final amendments which will total the additional \$208,000,000.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that this is not merely a question of arithmetic. It is a question of estimates. The Department of Defense estimated that they would have unobligated balances totaling \$398,000,000. The facts are that they were not able to obligate the funds as rapidly as they had expected. It is admitted that \$270,000,000 additional will not be obligated, and we cut off \$200,000,000 leaving them some little leeway. The other items are highly doubtful, and that is the reason the committee did not base its cut on them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I beg to disagree with the gentleman on the doubtfulness of it, just on the basis of the report. If you will look at page 20 of this hearing, you will find that the figure of \$1,576,000,000 and you will find that the only amount they could actually figure out was \$219,000,000 that they had actually allocated of the \$357,000,000. It is better explained on page 15. That item of \$219,000,000 was all that they could figure and you subtract that from \$357,000,000, and you get this \$138,000,000, which you have to add to the \$270,000,000 that you recognized does exist. There are the two items totaling \$408,000,000.

Mr. GARY. They claim they have authorizations for those amounts. The question of how firm the authorizations are, is somewhat doubtful. But it is a question of estimates. Of course, the year is not over, and they will obligate some of these funds before the end of the year. I think the program will be speeded up because of our investigation, because if we had not gone into it

there might have been even greater unobligated funds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman has done a splendid job on this. However, this question of obligation is the very point I raised on the floor in consideration of the authorization, that you have to get into these contracts and obligations.

I want to direct attention, on page 2, to a new word that has been introduced into our language. That is the word "deobligation." That is a beaut, because that is exactly what they have been doing. They will obligate and then they will deobligate, and use it for something else. So we have actually got "deobbligedook" in our language.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. There is another word that I was not familiar with which is in the subcommittee's hearings, and that is "shortfall." Shortfall means the agencies tell us "We were going to obligate a lot of money and we fell short. We cannot find any way to expend it."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is exactly right. That is the way we are going ahead on these appropriations. That is exactly the way to get to it. The next step is to begin to examine some of these contracts where they say they have obligated it, because you will find some real fraud, and I use that word advisedly, in some of these contracts. One proof of it, if you will notice in this particular report, their normal amount of obligations of moneys per month is a very low figure until they get to the very date when they shall come before the Congress to have them obligate it, and then all of a sudden that figure is increased 100 percent, or even 200 percent. In other words, they are getting it obligated before they come in here. If you will look at the contracts in which that money is obligated, you will begin to see the fraud. I say under this supplemental testimony, a few well placed courts martial might very well solve a lot of our problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

THE AIM OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY IS WORLD PEACE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the conferees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives have laid before us their report on the mutual security bill for fiscal 1953. The report calls for an authorization of \$6,400,000,000, reconciling the difference in amounts approved respectively by the Senate and the House. I feel that the approval of the appropriation, which authorizes \$1,500,000,000 less than the President requested, is in the best interests of our Nation and of world peace, and I want to urge the Members of this body to take favorable action on mutual security appropriation.

OBJECTIVES OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The Mutual Security Program, envisaged in the bill before us, is a logical extension of the steps which our Na-

tion has been taking during the past 7 years to insure world peace. It forms an integral part of our foreign policy which has a twofold objective: To strengthen the free world economically and unite it in common defense, so that we can meet any threat to peace with force; secondly, to further the free development of those areas which do not directly form a part of the Western World, and to strengthen those bonds of friendship which unite those areas with us.

The Mutual Security Program is exactly what the term implies. It consists of a planned effort to create and fully develop a defensive organization among the free nations, to which each member will contribute in proportion to its means. The efforts and contributions which we are expending—and will expend in the future—to develop this organization, will strengthen our mutual security. They are as much to our advantage as they are to the advantage of the other free nations.

The bill before us, as I stated earlier, is a part of our foreign policy. It can only be judged in terms of our over-all endeavors in the field of foreign affairs, and in the light of our achievements in that sphere.

IS OUR FOREIGN POLICY A FAILURE?

Now there are some persons who, for their own reasons, have condemned our foreign policy as a failure. They argue in many different ways to reach that conclusion. I feel that there is only one right way of approaching this question: the way of looking at concrete facts, of evaluating them impartially, and of reaching conclusions from facts.

The clearest and easiest way of doing this, in my opinion, is by looking at the world as it was 7 years ago, and comparing it with the world today.

POST-WORLD WAR II PICTURE: 3 SPHERES

Let us first look at the world as it was during the immediate post-World War II period.

As we came out of World War II, and demobilized our Armed Forces, we saw the following picture on the world scene: The globe was roughly divided into 3 spheres—the western world; the Soviet orbit; and what I term as the "third sphere."

I need not remind you of the conditions that prevailed at that time in the western world. There was a group of nations, economically ruined, ravaged by war, and demoralized to the point where they could become an easy prey to any aggressor. There was no unity of purpose among them, and no other ambition except to go home and try, as best as they could, to individually patch up their wounds.

On the other hand, there was the Soviet Union, dominating one-sixth of the world's land masses, and one-third of world population. The Communist orbit, despite the destruction of war, was militarily stronger than ever, and ready to extend its dominion over the rest of the globe.

In the third sphere, there stretched the vast territories of Africa, the Middle and Near East, and large areas of Asia,

largely populated by starving masses of diverse races and nationalities, crying for freedom and a better way of life. Large portion of those areas was permeated with a spirit of revolution, similar to the one which the western world experienced a century and a half ago. This third sphere could either become a tool in the hands of the Communists, or side with us.

THE AMERICAN IDEA

Having this over-all picture, let us look at the course which our Nation decided to pursue. Let us recall the bold foreign policy which was enunciated by the Democratic administration, and measure its accomplishments.

Instead of withdrawing from the rest of the world, as some had advocated, and unrealistically hoping that peace and contentment would follow in the wake of an obsolete isolationist policy, we decided not to retreat into the dangerous and deceptive dreamers' paradise, but to face facts. Our own experiences during World War II showed us that the era of regional security went out with the atomic bomb, with transcontinental air flights, and with successful transoceanic invasions.

Faced with these circumstances, we decided to work for the establishment of lasting world peace. We embarked upon a program of helping the free nations of the world to get back on their feet, of unifying them in common defense, of stopping further Communist expansion, and of sharing our technological know-how with the underdeveloped areas of the world.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

In pursuance of that policy, we have accomplished the following things:

In the first place, despite the preponderance of manpower and war matériel strength of the Soviet orbit, we have succeeded in stopping further Communist advance. In fact, we repelled and turned back Communist expansion in Greece and Turkey, forced them to withdraw from Iran, and are stopping it today in Korea.

Secondly, we helped the free western nations to rebuild their ravaged economies. Through the Marshall plan, and the ECA, we helped them get back on their feet.

Thirdly, we have organized and perfected a defensive organization of the free nations. Through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the present Mutual Security Program, we unified the Western World in a desire to attain lasting peace, and we gave it the means with which to attain that objective.

Fourthly, through the point 4 program, we came to the help of the underdeveloped areas of the world. We have been gaining friends within the third sphere—the same sphere which could have easily fallen into Communist hands.

Fifthly, through the Rio pact and subsequent efforts, we have solidified the nations of the Western Hemisphere, bringing them into closer relationship with our country than ever before.

Lastly, we have avoided what appeared inevitable in 1947: the outbreak

of a global atomic war, which would have subjected the world to ruin beyond description.

We did all of these things, while at the same time preserving the economic stability of our own Nation, maintaining full employment, and improving the general welfare of our people.

LOOKING AHEAD

I believe that the facts which I have briefly outlined, point to the conclusion that our foreign policy has been eminently successful in bringing us closer to the realization of our ultimate goal: the establishment of lasting and just peace in the world.

We must continue in our efforts to attain that goal. We can do it today by approving the appropriation before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] is recognized.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is the strangest argument I have almost ever heard. I have been in the obligating department in the Navy, in the early part of World War II. There was great pressure in my department, the Bureau of Ordnance, to obligate toward the end of the year, because they said if we did not obligate we would not get the funds. I would be very happy now if these unobligated funds had gone up to a \$1,000,000,000, because I think that prudent management and careful obligation is what we are after. I think that by taking these unobligated funds and discouraging the showing of as much unobligated funds as possible only encourages these services to spend their money without regard to where it goes. I hope that this amendment will be defeated and I hope that in the future this Congress will gladly congratulate any branch of the service that comes up with more unobligated funds than they expect. There is no trouble on earth to obligating funds. You can go out and make contracts, because they know they are coming up in the future. You can give letters of intent, but whenever any branch of the Government brings back more unobligated funds than they anticipated, I think it is cause for congratulation. It shows prudent management.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would agree if the unobligated funds went back into the Treasury; but, as the gentleman well knows, this agency insists that the unobligated funds be left in their hands. Therefore, we should recapture these funds and put them back into the Treasury where they belong.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand it, even after we make the cut the gentleman has proposed, we are still leaving them with a petty cash emergency amount of between two hundred and two hundred and fifty million dollars. All that they asked of you and me in committee was unobligated that they could use the un-

obligated funds for needed purposes and obligate after the end of the year.

Mr. CHATHAM. I appreciate what the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Ohio have said. I sat through 9 weeks of hearings and I have a letter of congratulation from my chairman that I was the third man in attendance. I am satisfied that these funds are being spent by just as patriotic, able, and honest people as any of us here.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman from Missouri used the word "fraud," and he said he used it advisedly. If he has any evidence of fraud, should he not present it to the Department of Justice or to proper authorities?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, the report of the gentleman's committee is the very basis of it; as a matter of fact, that hearing should be submitted to the Department of Justice.

Mr. CHATHAM. I would say that we could trust the people spending this money and hope that next year they will come back with twice as much unobligated money. I do not think that any of you who may be members of an organization would expect your associates to criticize you for being able to report your company in a better cash position at the end of the year than you expected.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

(Mr. BROWNSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. BROWNSON addressed the Committee. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that these funds will be taken from the military assistance program for Europe. Title I deals with Europe. This is the NATO program which is so essential to the containment of communism in Europe.

The program for the NATO and other European countries was determined at a conference held in Lisbon just a few months ago. This appropriation is based upon the requirements of the part of the program which the United States, subject to the approval of Congress, agreed to assume.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand it, the Department had said at one time it would have unobligated \$400,000,000 and that turned out to be \$669,000,000. \$400,000,000 is accounted for appropriately as I understand it by the necessity for obligating funds before the end of the fiscal year, leaving \$269,000,000 which the committee cut \$200,000,000, leaving

the other \$69,000,000 as latitude in the situation. That is the issue?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. This amendment is seeking to cut it \$208,000,000 which the gentleman says would cut into the bone.

Mr. GARY. That is correct and I may say that there is no semblance of fraud in the matter. It is simply a question of estimates. It is difficult in a program of this magnitude to determine the exact amount it will be possible to spend within a given time. Insofar as obligating large sums at one time is concerned, let me say that the amounts of monthly obligations vary greatly because in 1 month they may make a contract covering a large number of tanks or airplanes which would make a very large obligation for that particular month.

I have the monthly figures here running back to 1950. In August 1950 they obligated only \$62,000,000; in May 1951 they obligated \$1,092,000,000; in March of 1952 they obligated \$1,188,000,000. It is not a uniform procedure and the fact that they do have some unobligated funds is certainly not a matter for condemnation. They should be complimented for not rushing out and obligating funds without proper consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the gentleman should be commended for bringing out that particular point because it shows good business administration. They could have obligated all of it.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are doing a good job and they should be given credit for it.

Mr. GARY. Absolutely.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. If they had obligated all of these funds, does not the gentleman think these same people would be in here trying to cut this appropriation anyway?

Mr. GARY. I know there has been continuing opposition to the program from some who are now offering the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. CRAWFORD.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 75.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military assistance, title II: For assistance authorized by section 201, \$530,316,500; and in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 201 of said act shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 30, line 18, strike out "\$530,316,500" and insert "\$499,166,500."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I mentioned, which cuts \$31,200,000 off this item. It is only one part of that which goes to make up the total of the \$208,000,000 about which we spoke.

I am not going to take the 5 minutes because I think the matter has been debated sufficiently. However, I do want to make one comment about this matter of obligated funds. The argument has been advanced that we ought to encourage these people to obligate the funds in orderly procedure. If we pursue this method we encourage them to come in and, I will again use the word, fraudulently obligate these funds ahead of time before they have a real, firm contract. I submit that is a pretty shabby argument, to say that if we try to hold these people in line they then will engage more carefully in this program of obligating funds when they cannot reasonably and intelligently obligate them.

After all, the test is this: We authorize funds, we appropriate money for them on the basis of a presentation, and then the only check we have on whether that authorization and appropriation was justified is the experience of whether or not they actually can go ahead and spend the money wisely and legitimately. I say when we find that they cannot spend the money wisely and legitimately we ought to cut it back.

That is exactly what the situation is here. If you are talking about encouraging them to pull the wool over the eyes of Congress more, then I say that Congress ought to stand on its hind legs and resist and do again what I say: Where these contracts are not firmly entered into, are not entered into in good faith, and are simply to obligate those funds, a few well-placed courts martials will do the job.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. If we adopt this series of amendments, according to the figures I have attempted to put together, we will not have cut the full amount of the estimated expenditures for military aid by the amount, \$1,240,000,000, which they plan to expend in fiscal 1955. Even if they took it all out at the tail end, all we are doing is delaying for another look these proposed expenditures for fiscal 1955, so that we can see a little later whether they will be needed, whether we are going to have allies willing and able to use that military equipment 2 or 3 years from now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that this amendment will take \$31,200,000 from military assistance to Greece,

Turkey, and Iran. If there is any more critical part of the globe I do not know where it is. Yet after all the cuts that have been made in this bill it is proposed now to cut \$31,000,000 from that vital defense area.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 73, noes 82.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and Mr. GARY as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 100, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Economic and technical assistance, title II: For assistance authorized by section 203, \$50,822,750; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 203 of said act (except the amounts allocated or available for the purposes of sections 204 and 205 of said act) shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

THE KERSTEN AMENDMENT: THE BASIS FOR A REPUBLICAN FOREIGN POLICY OF LIBERATION

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, contained in title I of the Mutual Security Act, as you will recall, is a provision providing that not more than \$100,000,000 is to be used from these funds for military assistance to Europe, to aid selected persons who had escaped from and were residing in Communist-dominated countries, to form those escapees from the Soviet-dominated countries into national military units, or for other purposes.

This law was enacted in October of last year. I wish to refer to a sentence in the hearings which refers to this \$100,000,000 and to the fact that \$4,000,000 has been used of these funds for the purpose of relief to escapees. The statement in the hearings is:

This use does not in any way prejudice the intent of the escapee provision to form escapees into military units, supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Although this law was enacted last October, these military units have not been set up. The meaning of this amendment is, among other things, that these escapees could be formed into national units of their own nationality, free battalions of Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, and even Russians, Ukrainians, and so forth, in the uniforms of their own nationality. They would fly the flags of their own nationality, flags representing the freedom of their country. This provision, as I say, has not been implemented. When it was enacted into law, you will recall, the Soviet Union became very violent about this provision, charging that it was an aggressive act on the part of the United States. It is hardly necessary to

point out to the members of the committee the importance of these military units. It has this importance, for one thing: When General Gruenther testified some months ago that there were 60 satellite divisions on the Soviet side, those 60 satellite divisions could be placed potentially on our side by setting up these free military units that would be the cadres of armies of liberation when the day comes.

Just imagine, Mr. Chairman, if America were taken over by the Reds and our forces were under Soviet control, the effect of free military units of American soldiers with American uniforms and American flags in Canada or Mexico or elsewhere; what effect would these military units have upon American boys under Soviet domination? It would disintegrate the hold of the Soviets upon American forces. So will the setting up of these national units in Western Europe do a great deal toward disintegrating the control and the hold of Stalin upon the 60 satellite divisions of Eastern Europe. This could well mean the difference between victory and defeat in Europe.

I suspect that this amendment has not been implemented because the administration is tied to the policy of containment, and this amendment definitely points toward the ultimate liberation of these Eastern European nations. These military units should have been set up long ago. They should have been set up the first part of this year. A representative of the Army called at my office in January or February of this year and stated that the Army had completed plans for the setting up of these units, and the plans are now with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I suspect that the hand of the State Department stayed the implementation of these units. Of course, it strikes right down to the very fundamental proposition of the difference between a foreign policy of containment and a foreign policy of liberation. That is a basic issue that will face this country this fall and this coming year; and we on our side, I am confident, are going to support a foreign policy of liberation.

The administration will not implement the Kersten amendment because the amendment is based on liberation rather than on its bankrupt and negative policy of containment.

I predict that the Republican Party at its national convention will adopt the dynamic and affirmative foreign policy plank of liberation of the nations and peoples held captive by the Communists. Such a policy looks toward the defeat of world communism and the ultimate freedom of all peoples.

Such a Republican policy of liberation will be in sharp contrast to the containment-appeasement policy of the Truman-Acheson administration that for decades would continue to confiscate most of our earnings in taxes, draft our boys, and end in an all-out world war III. The Marxian Socialists who have infiltrated the Truman administration are responsible for this deadly and un-American containment-appeasement policy. Marxian Socialists are blood

cousins of the Communists. That is why they seek only to appease and never to defeat them.

A Republican foreign policy of liberation versus the Marxian Socialist policy of containment and appeasement will be the basic issue facing the American people this fall. The happiness of our children and the future of our country will await the issue.

Such a new policy of liberation will break clean with communism. It will chart the path of freedom for the captive nations and end the threat of world war III at its source. This will mean a foreseeable end to high taxes, heavy armaments, and, most important, the drafting of American boys, which the Marxian Socialists of the administration would carry on forever. ROBERT TAFT, General Eisenhower, and the Republican foreign policy adviser, John Foster Dulles, are in favor of a policy of liberation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time not to delay action on this bill, but to endorse heartily what the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] has said. Many of our colleagues will remember last August when the amendment now known far and wide as the Kersten amendment, appropriating \$100,000,000 for a special purpose to mutual security, was put in the legislation. At that time it was understood by many of us, perhaps by most of us, that that money could be used in order to establish military strength among the refugees who had escaped from behind the iron curtain.

I, too, regret, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has expressed his regret, that this appropriation of money has not been used. I say in all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, that I believe had that \$100,000,000 been used, wisely and carefully, it could have had more effect in counteracting the threat of Communist aggression in Europe than any billion dollars we have appropriated for either military or mutual security.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I, too, should like to associate myself with the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Wisconsin. I believe with you that these funds if properly used could be a tremendous and effective weapon in the hands of the Western Allies. There are hundreds and thousands of human beings coming into the Western World from behind the iron curtain, people who want to contribute, who have something to contribute, and certainly we should make use of their talents.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. May I make this personal reference: Just a few weeks ago I had the privilege of conferring with General Anders, who was a brave and outstanding leader of the Polish Army attached to the American Army headed by General Clark during the campaign in north Africa and Italy in World War II. He and those brave Polish soldiers

distinguished themselves as they fought with us against Nazi tyranny. I sat in General Anders's office surrounded by his staff, which he still holds together, in the city of London, and he was anxious and eager that he and his soldiers be permitted to join as a member of this European defense army.

I think we need legislation to back up what we are trying to do and I would like to see, even in the closing days of this session, legislation providing for an army of liberation, which would include not only General Anders and his officers, together with these Polish soldiers now in exile, but also other national units which, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said, could fight under their own officers, in their own uniforms and under their own flags. They would serve as a symbol that they are fighting or at least that they are ready to fight for the defense not only of Western Europe but of their own homelands, in Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic states, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and elsewhere.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman mentioned the name of General Anders. May I say to the gentleman that General Anders came before our committee appointed by the House to examine into the Katyn massacre tragedy and he rendered every possible service he could. He is a brave soldier, a great man, and the people that he is leading are worthy of all the encouragement we can give them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I want to join with the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Wisconsin in their effort and to say that we need an affirmative policy for liberation, not just a containment policy. We who have Rumanians, Lithuanians and others from that part of the world in our districts know they will help liberate their countries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I appreciate the gentleman's remark. There is not a Member of this House representing an urban area in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, or any other State but has many constituents who came to America, or are descendants of immigrants from eastern European countries who are ready and anxious and eager to join with us in this fight. Let us create an army of liberation and offer hope to these people behind the iron curtain that they, too, some day may be liberated from the enslavement of Communist control.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the interest the gentleman has in this evidently very vital project. Can he

assure me if we take such people into a unit to defend the democracies, people who have come from behind the iron curtain, we can depend on having the right people?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. They would have to be screened carefully. I may say to the gentleman that this question has been carefully considered, not only by General Gruenther and the NATO staff, with whom I talked about this problem recently, but other military leaders in Europe. They have gone over that matter carefully, and assure us the refugee units could make up an effective force.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military assistance, title III: For assistance authorized by section 301, \$540,807,500; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 301 of said act shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWNSON: Page 31, line 16, after "section 301", strike out "\$540,807,500" and insert "\$515,847,500."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROWNSON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROWNSON]. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the geographic element in this particular amendment is being minimized to a greater degree than necessary. As I read title III it refers to the general area of China, including Thailand, including Indochina, including the Philippines, and including the Nationalist Government of the Republic of China, which at the present time is located on Formosa.

As the Members of this House know, we entered into a mutual security agreement with the Republic of the Philippines, and part of the funds in this particular section go toward the mutual defense of that particular part of the far-eastern area. There we have, for example, the Government of China, and it seems to me here early this afternoon the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] commented on the fact that while the Chinese Army, which numbered somewhere between five and six hundred thousand on the Island of Formosa, was in good shape physically, they did not even have shoes with which to march. There are people in this Congress who are demanding, in fact, that we use these Chinese troops to invade the mainland of China. But how are you going to train that army up to its maximum power if you do not appropri-

ate the funds to see that this army is trained, and at the present time it is far from trained, if we can take the testimony of General Olmsted and others who testified before our committee and also before the Committee on Appropriations?

Then, insofar as Indochina is concerned, that likewise is connected with the common defense against the spread of Communist aggression. While Indochina is something like 11,000 miles from here and perhaps 7,000 miles from France, nevertheless the French there are making a great contribution, and we are helping them to the best of our ability to maintain the flank in Asia and to keep away from Russian Communists the oil, rubber, and tin of that part of the world.

It is my understanding, on the basis of the testimony before our committee, that the French this year, doing their share, are spending more than one-third of their defense budget in the war in Indochina, and that that amounts to well over \$1,400,000,000.

So I hope you will pay particular attention to this part of the world and keep in mind what would happen if enough defense support and enough military support is not sent to the Philippines, to Indochina, and to Formosa. I hope you vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself in opposition to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON], but I am opposed to this amendment. I have tried to consider each item in an appropriation bill on its merits. I have never been a believer in across-the-board percentage cuts, although as I said earlier, due to the fact that we have transfer authorization in this particular legislation, it may not make much difference where the cuts are made. However, I would be unwilling to participate in any cut of military money that is supposed to go, at least in part, to Formosa.

Admiral Radford was back here recently and the papers quoted him as dismayed at the obsession of the Government and the Congress with Europe and their neglect of the part of the world, Asia, where we are fighting a bitter war and where the struggle may expand.

Even though this is not a big cut, \$24,960,000, I am opposed to it, because I think the Congress needs to take every opportunity to emphasize the importance of the defense of that area in our own security interest.

I did not feel that the original requests were very large for this area, compared with the gigantic requests for Europe, when they came before the Foreign Affairs Committee. Since then, without my vote, the amounts for military aid in the Far East have already received cuts. I am unwilling to participate in even a token or symbolic cut of appropriations for military purposes in the part of the world that involves Formosa, Indochina, Thailand, and the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I merely want the Members of the House to know what they are voting on. This amendment would cut \$24,960,000 from military assistance to China, Indochina, the Philippines and Thailand. They are the only nations involved.

The gentleman from New Jersey told you just a few moments ago about the conditions which he witnessed on Formosa. I witnessed the same conditions. This talk about the Nationalist Chinese Army invading the mainland is silly unless we give them more training and more equipment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I just cannot believe that the House today, voting in the best interest of the America we love so much, will approve this amendment.

Mr. GARY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question: Does the gentleman consider that the army we saw in Formosa was in condition to invade the mainland of China?

Mr. CANFIELD. Of course not.

Mr. GARY. Exactly. If we ever want the Nationalist Army to invade the mainland or even to defend Formosa we must assist in training and equipping the troops.

That is the purpose of these funds. If you do not want them properly trained and equipped vote for this amendment. If you do, vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Economic and technical assistance, title III: (a) For assistance authorized by section 302 (a), to be furnished under the applicable provisions of section 503 of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, \$202,778,250; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made available pursuant to section 302 of said act and allocated or otherwise available to the Mutual Security Agency (except unexpended balances of funds allocated for assistance to Burma and Indonesia) shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation; (b) for assistance authorized by section 302 (a) to be furnished under the applicable provisions of the act for International Development, as amended, \$118,634,250; and, in addition, unexpended balances of (1) appropriations heretofore available pursuant to section 302 of said act and allocated or otherwise available to the Technical Cooperation Administration, and (2) funds allocated for assistance for Burma and Indonesia, shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 32, line 7, strike out "\$118,634,250" and insert "\$67,793,000."

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am offering will cut \$50,000,000 from an item of \$118,634,250, for so-called technical aid to Asia and the Pacific. The committee proposes to give a 35 percent increase over the amount we gave last year for the same purpose. In 1951 this program cost \$24,602,000. In 1952 it jumped to \$87,700,000. This amendment will move it to \$67,700,000.

The boondoggling technical-assistance program started off to be an inexpensive, good-neighbor program, under which we would spend a little money to send technical experts to backward countries to give them technical information which they do not possess, and which we do possess.

You will find the item which I seek to amend set out in the committee report on page 59. It is listed there under Title 3—Asia and Pacific, and the particular item is the third item in that column, listed "Technical cooperation—TCA."

The details of this so-called technical-assistance program are set out in the hearings in tables which are printed on pages 693, 694, and 695 of the hearings.

You will see by referring to these tables that the greater portion of this money is scheduled to go to India and Pakistan. As I stated before, this so-called technical-assistance program started out to be an inexpensive, good-neighbor program. For the 1951 fiscal year we appropriated \$5,193,000 to give technical information and assistance to India.

If properly spent, it seems to me that \$5,000,000 ought to pay for enough technical information to last a long time and do India a lot of good. However, it was not nearly enough for the global spenders who want to bring every country in the world up to the American standard of living. For 1952 the appropriation was jumped to \$54,565,000, an increase of \$49,000,000; and the bill now before us proposes another \$23,000,000 increase over last year's \$54,000,000, making the so-called technical assistance for India in this bill \$77,517,000. This is a jump in 2 years of more than \$72,000,000 in a spending program which started out to be a little inexpensive good-neighbor program of furnishing technical knowledge and information to backward people. Yet the hearings show on page 698 that supplies and equipment now are about 10 to 1 as compared to services.

For Pakistan we started out in 1951 with \$448,000. This was increased by more than \$10,000,000 in 1952, the amount being \$10,778,000, and we propose in this bill a still further increase for the next year of \$12,000,000, the total carried in this bill being \$22,581,000.

In addition to the tremendous increase over the 2-year period for India, you will remember that last year Congress voted \$190,000,000 to send grain to India to relieve a so-called grain shortage.

If this thing is not brought to a halt, there is no telling how many billions

of dollars and do-gooders and world spenders are going to take from the pockets of American taxpayers to pay for this pyramiding, snowballing, world-wide WPA program, which got its foot in the door under the guise of a technical information program, and which in a 2-year period, insofar as India is concerned, has jumped from \$5,000,000 a year to \$77,000,000, and insofar as Pakistan is concerned, has jumped from less than a half a year to \$22,500,000 a year.

I call your attention also to the fact, and you can see the figures on page 695 of the hearings, that at this time India has foreign exchange reserves, and that means a cash balance, of nearly \$2,000,000,000, and has a gross external public debt of less than half a billion dollars, while we instead of having any cash balance at all, have a national debt of \$259,000,000,000. I call your attention also to the fact that the same table shows on page 695 of the hearings that Pakistan, scheduled to get \$22,500,000 under this bill, also has foreign exchange reserves of \$631,000,000, and no external public debt at all. In the face of these facts, and in the face of our own weakened financial position, threatened with inflation as we are, we are proposing to increase these donations to these countries this year more than 35 percent over what we gave them last year.

I heard it said on the floor of the House last year in the debate on the grain bill that India has 180,000,000 sacred cows which they are maintaining, and 136,000,000 sacred monkeys which they are maintaining. The hearings on this bill show on page 696 that India's population is increasing at the rate of 4,000,000 per year. That means that in the next 10 years at the same rate India's population will increase by 40,000,000, which is one-fourth the total population of the United States.

I do not know the rate of increase of the sacred cows or the rate of increase of the sacred monkeys. However, being protected as they are by the people of India against slaughter of any kind, on religious scruples, I would say it is reasonable to assume that there is a substantial rate of increase.

In my opinion it is foolish in the extreme for America to assume the responsibility of furnishing money to raise the standard of living of nearly 400,000,000 people in India up to our own standards, and at the same time provide for maintaining 180,000,000 sacred cows, and 136,000,000 sacred monkeys.

Reading on in the hearings, I see on page 697 that Mr. Stanley Andrews, the Administrator of this Technical Cooperation Administration, testified before the committee that they proposed to drill a 250-foot well on each 200 acres of the Ganges Delta, or basin, and sink an 8-inch steel pipe in every one of these wells. He proposes to drill 2,000 of these wells to supply water for the Ganges Delta.

If we are going to begin to dig wells on each 200 acres of farm land anywhere in the world, I would like to see the program begun in the United States, where we can use these wells to just as much advantage as the farmers in the

Ganges Delta. To begin with, I do not think this Government ought to dig wells for farmers anywhere. But if we are going to dig them, one for each 200-acre farm, we can use a lot of them for irrigation purposes in the State of Georgia.

Mr. Andrews proceeds to say that there are other developments of a similar nature in other areas in connection with a power dam. So this world-wide WPA program is proposing to sink irrigation wells in some parts of India, build dams in other parts, and after describing the program, Mr. Andrews proceeds to say, and I quote his language:

I think this is probably the cheapest way if we are going to take on her responsibilities.

I am not in favor of taking on India's responsibilities to feed her rapidly increasing population, and her sacred cows and her sacred monkeys. We are overreaching ourselves. By all means this program should be increased over what it was last year. It should be reduced, and this amendment will do it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are a number of Members on their feet. That would not give more than a minute or two for each.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is in error. It would be less than 1 minute.

Mr. DONDERO. I was trying to be conservative. I think the gentleman from Virginia should increase the time.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] who just spoke referred to the situation in India and Pakistan, but as I read page 54 of the report India and Pakistan are not involved in this particular item. Will the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I will have to refer that to the committee. India

and Pakistan are involved, but I believe the committee will say that there are other countries included. Burma, Thailand, Nepal, and others are on the list.

Mr. GARY. The applicable table is on page 55 rather than 54.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I know how conscientious the gentlemen from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is. I regret to find myself in opposition to a sincere effort on his part to save money, but I wish to remind the committee of the history of the technical assistance program. I think it represents America's spirit at its best, operating in countries that need our help. I have been interested in the program from the outset. Some of the best speeches made for technical assistance have been made by my friends from the other side of the aisle. It is relatively an inexpensive program. It was molded by a great American, one whom we all greatly admired, Dr. Henry Bennett. His tragic death hurt the program as nothing else could.

I think it is well to point out that Mr. Stanley Andrews, his successor, has the same point as to fundamental principles.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] says this is boondoggling. The gentleman is mistaken about that. It is not boondoggling. It is cast in another direction and on another pattern. It is an inexpensive program, constituting on the whole every year less than one day's expense for our armament program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to agree with what our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], is saying. This is a cooperative program. We have heard a great deal of talk about what would happen if China had not fallen. We might ask ourselves this question: What will happen to all of Asia if India and Pakistan do fall?

A program like this will lift these people up a little, give them two meals a day instead of one, give them a life span of 40 years instead of 27 years and give them a chance to have better shelter and better clothing. This is the kind of program that forms the cornerstone of our real foreign policy, and we should support it to the utmost.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman for that statement; and while he is speaking may I ask him if he agrees with me that all the dollars expended we receive from the money we put out in terms of good will as well as positive physical strength where we need it, if this is not the best dollar we can spend in the Orient which is such a critical area today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no doubt about that; and the gentleman knows that one of the exponents of this particular program is presently our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] who did so much to bring into being in China the joint rural reconstruction program which is in the same category as the point 4 program

which we are asked to implement at the present time.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is correct. Unfortunately, there are some items of a military nature carried in these appropriation figures but in the main this point 4 program does not cover the export of the product of our industry, of our manufactured goods and physical wealth but of our brains and know-how. This is the program that seeks to help other help themselves, one that is proving itself most effectively.

Mr. YATES. Is not this program under which we put the diplomats in the field where they come in contact with the common people, meet them on their own level, and help them solve their problems?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is it, exactly. This program is fundamental. If you can replace a wooden plow with a steel plow costing \$2 you may have helped him quadruple his returns. It is especially useful in India and other parts of Asia. Many Members of the House are familiar with the former extension service representative, Mr. Horace Holmes, now in India, and I am sure they appreciate his report of his work there. It has not been an effort to establish grandiose schemes in India, to change the pattern of the life of the people, not at all, but it is simply an effort to help people build a sound agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Wood] is recognized.

(Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, the people of America and the gentlemen of this House must soon awake to the realization that almost one-half of the fighting population of the world is now on the side of communism, due first to the mistaken policy of this administration in recognizing Russia many years ago; second, that after affording recognition we proceeded to arm and fatten her with fabulous amounts of consumer goods which we donated to her; and that last of all we gave her almost a third of the area of the globe.

I think everyone here will admit the fact that whatever peril communism is to us today the administration has largely created by its ignorance and ineptitude in foreign affairs.

You say that is water over the dam, and there is no use crying over spilled milk. Possibly, but the same administration, exhibiting the same crass ignorance, and an infantile complex of international messiahship, has encompassed the whole world in its schizophrenic schemes. Too many of the gentlemen in this House are suffering from delusions of grandeur so far as our ability to continue financing these crazy schemes much larger is concerned, even if they were not definitely doing more harm than good.

We have neither the men, money, raw materials, nor the lasting capacity to suffer possessed by Russia. We cannot destroy Russia even if we would. We must then learn to live with them

whether we choose it or not. We did for over 20 years before we recognized them.

And what is more important, other nations must also learn the same lesson. And in this connection we must remember that Russia has not taken over a single square mile of territory this administration did not offer to her on a silver platter.

Our task is clear and definite. We must follow the first law of nature—to save ourselves. We must build ourselves the strongest Air Force, the strongest Navy, the strongest array of antiaircraft guns, and the largest collection of A and H bombs. We must secure and maintain suitable air bases where necessary. We must maintain the best possible relations with our American neighbors.

To the other nations of the world which we have bled ourselves white to rehabilitate, we must now tell them that nature must take its course as far as they are concerned, at least until Russia demonstrates her first act of real aggression. When, and if that comes, we can then lay a realistic course as to what we shall do, fully armed, and strong, united, and self-reliant and unhampered by international drones in the hive of freedom, to whom—all too long—we have fed the economic honey gathered by the labor of American patriots, merely to increase our own national peril, with little additional safety gained from them.

We have hung too long on the cross of internationalism; it is time to tear the nails from our hands, leave the fog of international experiment, and get back to realistic Americanism, as the basis of a new foreign policy.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman from Arkansas just said this was merely a technical-assistance program. I want to call attention to page 697 of the hearings. Mr. Stanley Andrews, to whom the gentleman referred, the Administrator, testified before the committee that one of the things they propose to do is to drill a 250-foot well on each 200 acres of the Ganges Delta and sink an 8-inch steel pipe in every one of them—2,000 of those wells in the Ganges Delta, one on every 200 acres in that area. This is only one of the many boondoggling projects American taxpayers would pay for under this item.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. TABER. And that is why the gentleman from Georgia proposed to reduce this item down to where they could not do such silly things as that.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the table which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia read has two other figures

which should be determinative with the House. Those figures are, population of India—appearing on page 695 of the hearings—356,900,000; caloric intake per day per person, 1,600 calories, about one-half of what it is in this country and about two-thirds of what is necessary to sustain normal life, pretty close to the starvation level.

The gentleman made a statement that India has some billions of dollars of foreign exchange reserves. May I inform the gentleman that a good deal of that is in frozen sterling in London, and you know how much good that is going to do them.

We have just heard an eloquent statement made here that we should not deny military aid to Formosa, Indochina, Thailand, Philippines, and so forth, and that amendment failed. We can do the same thing about this, and this amendment should suffer the same fate. If we go to the people of the Far East and say the only assistance we are going to give them will be military weapons, we are in grave danger in the Far East. The way we will win with the people of the Far East is to add to our military security program, economic and technical assistance programs like this—programs which are inexpensive considering the issues involved.

A gentleman said a few minutes ago that it is foolish to build tube wells in India. But tube wells is what India needs. The curse of India is that it does not raise enough food for its population. The way to get India to raise more food is to improve her water supply. Are we to shut our eyes to that and even use our aid blindly? I say absolutely not.

Let me call your attention to one other matter. If they were in here asking \$500,000,000 for an Indian Army would you not give it to them? Of course you would. Yet you are going to cut down to \$50,000,000 for means to raise many times that amount in food which is vital and essential to every person in India. I cannot see how that kind of approach can be sustained in that critical area of the world because we all know that if India and Pakistan fall then Asia is truly gone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. I happen to be one Member of this House who believes that we cannot take the whole world on our lap and nurse it forever without destroying ourselves.

When I return to my district, people ask me: How long do you think, Mr. Congressman, the United States of America can stand the strain and expenditures now imposed on us? That is the question rising in the minds of our people. I believe we are nearing the brink of economic collapse. It may be later than we think.

To do good, of course, is the desire of everybody, but doing good in regard to

this world program should not be a one-way street. Let me call your attention to the fact that we are a member of the United Nations. India is also a member of the United Nations. Do you know that today India does not have one soldier standing beside our boys in Korea to resist the Communist horde? Why not? Does India favor freedom or communism?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we are hearing the same old story all over again here today that we can spend billions and buy friends all over the world. I should like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas, with the money we have already spent on this so-called point 4 program, how many friends we have made in the world? Where are these allies that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], inquired about a moment ago? Where on the battlefield of Korea, are these friends that we have bought with point 4 and other vast amounts dished out to foreigners in the last few years alone.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman has asked a good question, and I hope it can be discussed dispassionately, because we both love our country, and the world is in a crisis.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about point 4.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes. I made the statement which I will stand by, and I wish the gentleman from Iowa, coming from an agricultural State, to be informed on that point, and that is when we send competent individuals to these foreign countries to teach them methods that will revolutionize their agriculture, we are making friends.

Mr. GROSS. That leads to another question. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee this question: Is it the purpose to teach foreigners how to grow cotton?

Mr. GARY. If cotton is a proper commodity for that country, it is the plan to help them increase their production so that they can become a force in the general containment program of communism throughout the world. Let me say to the gentleman that containing communism is far more important than all of the cotton in the world, because our cotton will not be worth anything if the Communists take over America.

Mr. GROSS. Now I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] if he proposes to teach his point 4 friends how to grow tobacco, does he propose to take off the rigid restrictions on the export of tobacco seed so that they can plant and raise tobacco in competition with American tobacco farmers?

Mr. GARY. I would like to say to the gentleman that they do not grow tobacco in the city of Richmond.

Mr. GROSS. I am not talking about Richmond.

Mr. GARY. Please let me continue—if the gentleman thinks I have a special interest in this bill, but I say the same thing in reply. And, let me say to the gentleman that this program has been the greatest help to the tobacco people and to the cotton people of the United States that they have received since the war.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman asked me a question and I am trying to answer.

Mr. GROSS. I understand.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This entire program which is now before us, the mutual security program, is headed by a man named W. Averell Harriman, the only living person, as I understand, who attended all three conferences: Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Mr. GROSS. And a Wall Street banker.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And I think the gentleman and the House would be interested in a story that just came over the wire from Golden, Colo.:

W. Averell Harriman told the State Democratic Convention that "We'll make TAFT Stalin's candidate before we're through with this campaign."

"I can prove that Senator TAFT, if he is elected, will follow the road that Stalin wants him to follow," Harriman told the near-capacity crowd of some 2,000 Democrats. "We cannot and will not compromise with a man like TAFT who for political reasons would jeopardize our Nation."

By following policies set out by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman, Harriman continued, "Today we are winning the cold war, but we must not be impatient and lose what we have won."

This bill is financing the Harriman campaign and, of course, I think we ought to appropriate a little more money.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, whose amendment I support.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to say also that this program carries \$50,000,000 for steel. That is shown on page 698. It is not a technical assistance program. It carries \$10,000,000 for fertilizer, and I have already mentioned the 2,000 deep wells in the Ganges Delta. It is full of items like that. They jumped from \$5,000,000 in 1951 to \$77,000,000 in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been opposed to this international WPA. I get more opposed to it every year, and I get more indignant about it every time I find ourselves cutting down on the needed things here at home to try and oper-

ate a WPA not for India, not for Africa, but for the whole face of the globe. Anybody with any practical sense knows that we just cannot keep this thing up. It is about time that some of us take a stand and cut it out.

I recognize the motives of those who are supporting this thing and I appreciate their motives. I would love to be able to support the whole world, too, but we have a duty here at home. We must not break this Nation, we must not destroy the very foundation of our Nation by all this inflation.

Then they talk about the fact that this is to make friends, this is to help our friends. If there is anybody in this House who has ever seen or heard that Nehru has ever made a statement favorable to the people of the United States, I would like him to say so now.

Mr. FULTON. I will say it; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I deny the statement and I do not believe he ever did. I never did see it. The nearest I ever saw to a friendly statement from Nehru was when he had this thing under discussion last year about giving him 90,000,000 tons of wheat to feed to the starving people of India, including the sacred monkeys and the sacred cows. The nearest he ever came to making a friendly statement about the United States was when he said, "If they want to give us this 90,000,000 tons of wheat, we will accept it, but we want it understood that when we accept them we accept them without any strings. It does not mean anything as far as friendship is concerned." That is just about the effect of what he said.

Let us consider this point 4 technical assistance thing pretty seriously. Let us consider it from the standpoint of the American people, because we just cannot, as a matter of common, plain horse sense, continue to build this thing up and up and up, and grind down the taxpayers of the United States for the purpose of trying to reform the whole face of the globe, a thing that nobody but good God Himself can do.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. May I state to the gentleman that I think he is correct about this. I spent some time in India last year, and I did not find personally one person out of a thousand in India who had ever heard about American grain going to India. The grain sent there by the taxpayers of this country went to the rich merchants and the politicians. People are lying starving in the streets of Calcutta today, just the same as they always have.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We have pending before the Rules Committee this minute a bill that provides for paying for the household furniture of people who were run out of Korea that belonged to this technical assistance business when the war started. There were some 500 people we had employed in Korea. What they were doing I do not know. But they all got run out of there, and some of the bills for their household furniture run as high as \$20,000.

What in the world are we going to do if we keep on with this program? This thing is going to be ruinous unless we wake up and put some common sense into it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. A year ago last spring the chief of the Bureau of Reclamation, Michael Straus, went to India. He was sent there to try to give some of our hard-earned dollars to India. He was there 2 months. He could not give them a dollar. He came home feeling very bad because he had failed to accomplish his mission. They said, "We do not want your dollars. We will take a little know-how, but we do not want any of your dollars."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is the reason I objected to the consideration of this ECA-Korean evacuee bill that was on the private calendar. It was because of the payments to be made to some of those people.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope the motion to strike out the enacting clause will be voted down, and that the House will adopt the Davis amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 6, noes 112.

So the motion was rejected.

[Mr. MURDOCK addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the question of slashing the technical assistance program for all of south Asia is a very serious problem. This provision extends not just to India and Pakistan, it extends to Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia, that whole southern front. If we let that vital southern front fall because of a \$50,000,000 slash, we will have endangered this country.

When we hear these baseless statements that this technical assistance is a boondoggling proposition, it shows a complete lack of knowledge of the program. Here is what is involved—the access of the United States and the democratic countries to strategic minerals and materials. Our city of Pittsburgh gets about 30 to 40 percent of its manganese for the production of steel from India. We, in Pittsburgh do not want India to fall, for this reason as well as the fact it has been a good friend and ally in World War II. We do not want Malaya to fall either with its resources of rubber and tin, and we do not want Indonesia to fall, with its oil resources. We do not want these countries to fall into Communist hands. On top of that, if we Congressmen cut

Burma out, we would be doing irreparable harm. This is not just a point 4 program in Burma. This is also military aid for Burma, but it is grouped under the program with the other countries of this vital area.

What does India need more than water? India desperately needs water from the Ganges and below the surrounding plains in order to feed her starving people. She needs the water from the underlying water table brought up by wells so that the Indians can feed themselves. We must remember it was necessary for the United States to advance last year \$190,000,000 in a loan to make up India's current food deficit, and I believe she is going to pay it back.

In answer to the gentleman from Virginia, may I say that Nehru is one leader who has stood strongly against Communism in his own country. He has thrown Communists in jail time after time after time, and put down the demonstrations. That is more than the present Democratic administration has done in this country until forced into action by this Congress and the people. In addition to that, there is a real threat from the north, as we have seen Tibet taken over by the Communists.

When we on the Republican side say stand up not for a containment policy, but for an affirmative foreign policy that will hold these countries on our side, and hold these vital natural resources, and friendly peoples, we hope that you will vote to keep this particular provision as it is because this technical and military assistance program in protecting and developing southern Asia is vital to the defense of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am in support of the Davis amendment 100 percent. The gentleman from Montana and the gentleman from Arkansas made quite a show here a few moments ago about how this program has demonstrated its efficacy. This program is so young and so small, and it has fluctuated so much since its beginning, that it has demonstrated nothing so far as efficacy is concerned. Anyone who has ever determined policies would have to come to that conclusion, if he were trying to reach a decision as to what he was going to do with this kind of policy provided he was financing it with his own funds. The yardstick is too short. You have not had a chance to demonstrate what it can do. It started out to export technical knowledge. The gentleman just said that this was a military-assistance program. Good Lord, who knows what this program is? You change it continually. It will go on. You talk about this money saving all these countries, which our friend has just mentioned. The bill will be \$150,000,000, not \$15,000,000,000 if you are to give all these things. No one knows that any better than the gentleman from Pennsylvania. You are not going to save that part of the world with \$15,000,000 or even \$15,000,000,000. When you go into that big area, with our shortage of manpower, you will be dealing in figures of \$150.-

000,000,000 to \$500,000,000,000, and do not kid yourselves with this kind of chicken feed. My opposition to this program is based on the fact that it has no firm foundation, it has no anchorage. It switches around just like a kite without a tail, and the argument here this afternoon in favor of this program demonstrates that fact completely.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, last year when this bill was before the House, I offered a motion to cut technical assistance in the Middle East. But, this fall, I had an opportunity to visit that area and southeast Asia and I think we would be making a tremendous mistake to cut this money out of the bill. Many of us feel that the United States has concentrated its attention too much on Western Europe. We will spend several billions for Western Europe in this bill. Yet, here is an area, Asia, where the Communists are attempting to seize control, where the money is to be spent among several hundred million people, and where the tide of events has been moving against us. The Communists are now the second largest party in India. The Communists made tremendous strides there in the last election. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] pointed that the life expectancy of people in India is 26 or 27 years, and they are increasing at the rate of five million a year—at a rate much faster than the available food supply.

The Communists have a chance of seizing all of Asia in the next 5 or 6 years. What weapons do we have that will stop them? The most effective is technical assistance. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is right, that the amount of money involved here is not sufficient to prevent their being attracted to the Communists, but it gives them some hope, at least, that their problems can be solved without turning to the Communists. We are planning to spend a very large amount of money in this area for military assistance, which is of secondary importance compared to this program. To cut technical assistance when the Communists are concentrating their efforts in this vital area seems to me a costly and great mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the question here is not quite as presented to the floor. Twice I have introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements from advisers of the point 4 program asking us not to spoil the program by the appropriation of large amounts of money. This is not the Holmes program, which probably takes \$14,000 or \$15,000 and does excellent work. This is not a matter of digging wells. I know the men who are digging the wells, and India was paying for them the last I heard. This is a matter of whether we adhere to the principles laid down by Henry Bennett, which are being departed from under the present program, and whether we will live up to the recommendations of the people who feel that

this should be a type of program such as we see in the Extension Service in the United States, where the nations themselves put up the money, put up the labor, and we give them the know-how.

I rise, therefore, in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. I have followed rather closely the point 4 program of technical assistance, and probably it has no more ardent supporter in the House than the gentleman now addressing you. But let me say to you—and I think I am qualified to speak on this and I want you to listen carefully—there is not enough technical manpower that can be sent over there to properly do the job. If you do send the number of people set up in this program, they are either going to be incompetent or untrained, or both. Not only will the money be wasted, but what to me is more dangerous, the sending of incompetent and poorly trained people to the field is going to be a vast detriment, not only to the cause of the people you are trying to help but likewise to ourselves.

I say to you, let us take this technical assistance program in its proper stride and not try to jam a whole bottle of medicine down the patient's throat just because one teaspoonful had a good effect.

I beg of you to support the Davis amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is recognized to close debate.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of this House will bear me out in the statement that never since I have been a Member of this body have I ever indulged in personalities in debate. In response to the attempt of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to embarrass me with questions concerning tobacco and cotton, may I say that I am a long, long way from the cotton fields of the South. Since my district has now been restricted practically to the metropolitan city of Richmond, as far as I know there is no tobacco grown in my district. But no program has contributed more to the cotton and tobacco growers of the South than the program which we are discussing at the present time. This program has furnished them markets. At the present time what we are trying to do in the technical assistance program is to develop backward countries so that they can help themselves, and as they develop they become markets where our products may be sold. In addition we strengthen them so that they can assist in this great war that we are waging against communism whether it be the hot war in Korea or the cold war in the rest of the world. We need allies; we need all of the help that we can get.

This program is not related to India alone; it provides technical assistance for Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Malaya, Nepal, and Pakistan.

They are backward countries; they need help.

Already this program has been cut 21 percent in the authorizing legislation; it is proposed here to cut it another \$50,000,000.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I would like to add to what the gentleman has said with reference to tobacco and cotton that the people of the cotton States would, I believe, accept any hazards in the way of potential competition from other countries aided by us in the interest of larger issues involved in our efforts to strengthen these countries.

But may I refer to another subject, if the gentleman from Virginia will permit me to continue a moment.

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman from Virginia, my good friend, Mr. SMITH, referred to Nehru and the implication of his argument was that we should not help India because of Nehru's attitude. But we can disagree with Mr. Nehru and yet distinguish between his government and the people of India. I do profoundly disagree with Nehru's policy in the Korean war. But it is to our credit that we will help the people of a country and still entertain differences of opinion with the head of their government. It would be impossible to make headway if another country should withhold aid from us in some of our joint international efforts because they do not agree with the Democratic administration.

I would like to add this, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is this: During the Second World War when our survival was involved, India sent into that conflict the largest volunteer army of any nation fighting with us. Furthermore, I entertain no doubt whatever as to Nehru's sympathies with the free world in the basic conflict with communism; as a responsible head of government, he has demonstrated in many ways his opposition to communism.

On the same page to which the gentleman from Georgia refers with reference to wells, it is pointed out that India spends \$3 to our \$1 in this effort, since we are sending help under a plan that draws out maximum Indian resources. I thank the gentleman for generously yielding to me.

Mr. GARY. And in that effort we are contributing technical assistance to provide those wells, and probably a slight amount of equipment. But, after all, this is a technical assistance program, and it was our technicians who worked out the plan of sinking these wells to meet a great need in India.

The CHAIRMAN. All other time on this amendment has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 124, noes 114.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military assistance, title IV: For assistance authorized by section 403 to carry out the provisions of section 401 of said act, \$51,685,750; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said section 401 shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY: On page 32, line 21, strike out "\$51,685,750" and insert "\$31,685,750."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offered a similar amendment to cut the military assistance to the South American republics last year, and I am offering it again now to cut \$20,000,000. It does not seem to me that there is any use spending as large an amount of money as this on military equipment to South American countries. They are not in a direct line of Soviet invasion. We are giving them a much smaller sum of money for technical assistance which they need far more than military assistance. I think this is an item on which a substantial amount of money can be saved, and therefore I am asking the House to approve a cut of \$20,000,000, leaving a total of \$31,000,000 for this program, which seems to be adequate and more than enough.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, the fourth amendment to the \$208,000,000 total cut would be included in this, and actually is a lesser amount, so that I will not be offering that particular amendment. I further call attention to the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Mutual Security Act of 1952, page 45. When that agency came before the committee to justify this previous item that had been included for \$38,000,000 for Latin America, the testimony was that "we had to wait for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to draw up the plans under the appropriation for the best use of the appropriation." There was none of this \$38,000,000 previously appropriated which had been obligated as of January 31, 1952.

This is not a question of whether you are for these programs or not. It is actually a question of accounting methods. This Congress just has not been following proper accounting methods in get-

ting at these appropriations. We do not know where they are going to spend this money. They cannot possibly justify it. I submit that if you will read the hearings of this committee on page 721, as to the Latin-American Republics, you cannot get any additional information about what they are going to do with it. It is in general terms. They do not have it obligated. There are no contracts that would justify it. Actually, we could cut out the entire amount, in my opinion, and we would not alter the program one iota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, if our old friend, Bob Rich, were here today, he would say, "Where are you going to get the money?"

I wonder if it ever occurred to the Members of the House that we owe \$260,000,000,000. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand millions. We owe two hundred and sixty thousand million dollars, that somebody in the generations that follow us must pay. By 1953 we will owe \$275,000,000,000, or two hundred and seventy-five thousand million dollars, a terrific burden we are imposing upon the generations to follow us.

It is about time we slough off on our spending, let these countries of the world slug it out a little harder, and give a bit of relief to the American taxpayer who has generously over the past several years supported all of these programs for the rehabilitation of these devastated countries of the world. It is about time we gave relief to the American taxpayer.

I support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the House will vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I do not claim to be an expert on foreign affairs, therefore I have to listen to people who are supposed to be experts in this field.

We just had an amendment offered and adopted to reduce the so-called technical aid or point 4 funds. If my understanding is correct, this point 4 program is based on the premise that out of the humanity and goodness of our hearts we are supposed to help the backward peoples of the world.

If my memory serves me correctly, within the last few days one candidate for the nomination for President being offered by the minority party who is supposed to be an expert in this field made a statement to the effect that the Russians were so backward that they were no more to be feared than a bunch of pollywogs swimming down a creek. If you put those two together, then why does not Russia qualify under this point 4 program? Maybe if you would send them some point 4 assistance out of the humanitarian goodness of your heart they would quit being dirty, filthy Communists.

I am taking the word of General Eisenhower, who is supposed to be an expert in this field. He says the Russians are so backward, so terribly ignorant, so in need of technical assistance, that they are no more to be feared than a bunch of harmless pollywogs swimming down a muddy creek.

How do you justify that advice, from a man who claims to be one of the outstanding experts not only in the field of foreign affairs but in the military field, with the approach we take today?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want the House to know what they are doing when they vote for this amendment. This amendment deals with the plan to defend the American continent. During World War II it was necessary for the United States to deploy a large part of its Armed Forces to South America to protect certain strategic military points in that area. For example, there is the Panama Canal to be defended, and other strategic points in South America. This is military assistance to the South American republics to enable them to participate effectively in a plan which has been worked out by the Department of Defense to protect America itself. This comes to our own shores.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Does not the gentleman believe that the defense of the United States should be our first concern, and if we are going to continue to scatter our hits all over the world, exhausting our resources and finances, that we will not be able to win a ball game, if we are called upon to do so?

Mr. GARY. I am trying to point out to the gentleman that this is the defense of the United States, which we are now dealing with and that the funds are very vital to the defense of our own shores.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the gentleman be able to give us some examples within the limits of security, of course, as to how this money would be spent particularly?

Mr. GARY. It is only \$51,000,000 for all of the South American Republics. It includes aid to Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Mr. KENNEDY. What sort of assistance?

Mr. GARY. Military assistance purely. It is military assistance, furnishing them with the necessary accoutrements of war for defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KENNEDY) there were—ayes 79, noes 89.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. GARY as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 104; noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

(Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

Ocean freight, voluntary relief packages, title V: For assistance authorized by section 535, \$2,587,500.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill includes \$9,240,500, the amount of the budget estimate for this program, that is, the movement of migrants. The intent of the act is to facilitate the movement of surplus manpower from certain countries of Europe to other countries where such manpower can be utilized. The program for 1953 calls for the movement of 140,000 migrants as compared with the planned movement of 137,500 in 1942.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to pay tribute to the gentleman who now occupies the chair at the moment, because it is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who was chairman of the House Judiciary Committee which considered this particular matter in Brussels last fall; and it was he and his committee who were responsible for working out an arrangement whereby the surplus manpower from certain European countries was given the opportunity under the leadership of this organization to migrate to other parts of the world where they were needed and where there was opportunity for them.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I wish to join the gentleman from Montana in his tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the outstanding statesman who now presides as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, for the wise and far-seeing work he has done on this problem both here and at Brussels. He followed through and helped in the selection of an outstanding man, Hugh Gibson, to be the international head of this program; and he took care that that type of man should be the head, and no other type. I want to join the gentleman in the remarks he is making.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As my colleague the gentleman from Ohio well knows, from constant observation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], he worked night and day in an attempt to get a good program going and put it into operation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, wish to join my colleague from Montana and my col-

league from Ohio in doing honor to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who did a splendid job and was greatly responsible for developing the idea of a technique to try to help solve one of the most nettling problems with our allies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CHATHAM. I want to pay my personal tribute and that of the people of North Carolina to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] for his indefatigable efforts to help solve this very difficult problem which means a great deal not only to the people of America but to the other people of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MANSFIELD was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I simply want to make this statement that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] was the author of the migrant amendment to the Mutual Security Act, that he appeared before our committee and made such a good case for what he was seeking to do that the amendment was reported out of the committee unanimously. Furthermore, our colleague from New York [Mrs. KELLY] played a very vigorous and important part in the Foreign Affairs Committee in behalf of this particular amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I join in the deserving tributes that my various colleagues have paid the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] not only in connection with the legislation that the gentleman from Montana has referred to but also that we all recognize that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is one of the outstanding Members of the House, one of the hardest working Members, one of the ablest Members, one of the most sincere Members, a man whose integrity and honor is above reproach.

Our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has devoted untiringly of his time and effort in an attempt to find a solution for the problems caused by the dislocation of peoples and surplus populations.

I was very much interested a few minutes ago when the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] made his remarks, and I think they were remarks that were very appropriate, in connection with an observation made by General Eisenhower. I am not going to refer to him as the candidate for Republican nomination for President; I refer to him in his capacity as General Eisenhower.

The General made a very unfortunate statement not long ago that disturbed me very, very much when he referred to the Russian people and their ignorance and that we should not fear them any more than we should fear polliwogs swimming down a muddy river. That to

me was an amazing statement because it was contrary to everything that General Eisenhower had said before.

I remember when he addressed us in the auditorium of the Library of Congress a few years ago. He made a strong speech warning us of the danger of communism. Again when he spoke at Abilene, he made a very strong, powerful speech, calling the attention of the people of America to this international conspiracy that threatened nation after nation and which had as its ultimate object the United States of America.

Over 3 years ago I made speeches of that kind in this House and I have made them continuously out of the House. In his Denver speech, after he made that unfortunate statement, he tried to recover and he did make some very strong statements in that speech calling the attention of the people of America to this great danger that confronts us. But the fact remains that he made a most unfortunate statement to the press that we had no more to fear than from polliwogs swimming in a muddy river. That sort of took the rug out from under those of us who have believed in a strong national defense.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the gentleman is speaking out of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is speaking on the question of "assistance" which will be found in line 9, page 33.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there are many of us who recognize and who strongly feel in connection with the national defense of our country that it is very important for us to render such assistance as we can within our means to other nations that are still outside of the iron curtain and to other peoples who desire their freedom and their independence.

I have always admired General Eisenhower for his strong leadership in that respect. I can remember when the mutual assistance bill was pending in the two committees of the Congress, and they voted a \$1,000,000,000 reduction, he sent two telegrams over from NATO, protesting against it, but further saying that under no conditions should there be any further reduction in the authorization made in that bill at that time. I admired him and I responded to his leadership, and then when I read this statement I felt very much disappointed, because I addressed the question to myself whether or not, as a military leader, he spoke one way and as a candidate for the presidential nomination of the Republican Party of the United States he spoke another way.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Now does the gentleman from New York deny that he made the statement about the polliwogs flowing down a muddy river?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(On request of Mr. JAVITS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. JAVITS. Since the gentleman has asked me a question, I would like to say this: The question is whether or not the gentleman has not wrenched that statement completely out of the context in which it was made, completely out of the thought of the man who made it, and whether the gentleman does not himself believe the only reason the statement was made was to make our people feel that they should not have megalomaniac fear with respect to the Russians, with which we all concur.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has repeatedly said that the spirit of America can meet any problem; the spirit of the American people and the desire of men and women to be free under God and under the law. The gentleman from Massachusetts has said that repeatedly. But the gentleman from Massachusetts has also said that while we should not fear we should not underestimate the danger that confronts us; we should go forward in meeting the problems of the day with optimism and confidence, but we certainly should not underestimate the challenge that confronts us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall only take a moment, but in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, let me say that General Eisenhower, when he made the remark to which the gentleman has referred, may have been, and indeed is reported to have said he was in fact referring to the Russian people as such rather than to the leaders of the Russian Government, one of whom has been characterized in certain other highly placed quarters as "Good Old Joe."

It will be fatal to the cause of world peace if we allow ourselves to forget completely that the power hungry, unscrupulous tyrants of the Kremlin do not necessarily reflect the thoughts, feelings, and aspirations of the unfortunate subjects whom they ruthlessly dominate. There is considerable evidence that the exact opposite is true. Under more enlightened and less ambitious leadership it is always possible that the Soviet Union will turn from the dangerous course it has been pursuing and join with other nations to achieve world peace and order. At least, we should not admit that is impossible, difficult as it may be at times to keep our patience as we are confronted with instance after instance of provocative conduct. To surrender, however, to the opposite view is to concede that peace is impossible and war inevitable. That step I am not

prepared to take. Nor apparently is General Eisenhower. But no one has heard from the lips of this great American any encomium or complimentary references directed to the present rulers of the Kremlin.

The Clerk read as follows:

MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

For contributions authorized by section 404 (b) of the act for International Development, as amended by section 10 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, \$15,708,750.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 33, line 13, strike out "\$15,708,750" and insert "\$9,171,333."

[Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has referred to the official position of the Congress. The official position of the Congress was expressed in a roll-call vote on the conference report of the authorization of the Mutual Security Act and it was not in fine print. It was in the same print as all the rest of it, that in estimating the 33½ percent payments of recipient countries should be included. That is, we went on a matching-fund basis. The House can work its will on this, but do not let anybody tell me, or tell any of us that what has been done here is against the expressed will of the Congress because the best way to find out what the Congress did is to see what it did on a roll call vote the last time it voted on this proposition.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Now, if you want to know what is spent on these various programs in accordance with the language that the gentleman from Ohio has just read, if you will turn to the hearings on page 748 you will find out. When these funds were justified before our committee, in order to be certain that they were not spending more than 33½ percent in accordance with the direction of Congress, we called for specific statements of the amounts that are being spent on these various projects. You will find that statement on page 784, where it appears that the estimated total project cost, per country, United Nations and specialized agencies, is \$24,033,205, whereas the estimated total government cost, that the governments themselves put up, is \$25,660,016. That makes a total of \$49,693,221. Our contribution under this bill is \$15,708,750, which is 32 percent of the entire amount. That is less than the 33½ percent specified in the authorizing legislation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman mention how the table on page 57 of the report relates to the figures which he has

just given? They show a total for these various organizations of \$14,000,000. I am having trouble to reconcile that with the figures which the gentleman has given us.

Mr. GARY. Fifteen million seven hundred and eight thousand dollars.

Mr. KEATING. Which includes one million for the organization of American States?

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. But I am having trouble to reconcile the \$14,000,000 figure with the one the gentleman has just given us as to expenditures.

Mr. GARY. That is our part of the contribution toward the \$24,033,000 on page 748. The \$24,033,000 is the amount that the United Nations Organizations, to which we contribute, gave to these various countries. The other column shows the amount that the countries put up themselves. Our contribution is a part of the \$24,033,000.

Mr. KEATING. What percentage of the total expenditure is the \$14,708,000 which appears on page 57?

Mr. GARY. That is 32 percent of the \$49,693,000 that appears in the two columns.

Mr. KEATING. Is the forty-nine-million figure the total expenditures of all of these various agencies?

Mr. GARY. That is the total expenditure. That is exactly what I am trying to point out. The total expenditures are \$49,693,000, rather than the \$24,000,000 which appears in the table on page 57. Our contribution, which is really \$14,000,000 instead of \$15,000,000, is less than 33½ percent of the total amount spent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. On page 744 the table given says, "1953 estimation for U. N. and specialized agencies, summary of estimated dollar cost of program by category"; and in the footnote it says, "United States share, 60 percent."

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Do these other countries figure their percentage contributions on the same figure?

Mr. GARY. That is the percentage of their contribution; but when you add to that the actual amount spent by the other countries, it totals \$49,000,000, and is absolutely in accord with the language of the authorizing legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and Mr. GARY.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 96.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

For contributions authorized by section 12 of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, \$16,481,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 33, line 17, strike out "\$16,481,000" and insert "\$6,666,667."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The last part of the motion is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The motion was agreed to.

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 2½ minutes, but I see here on page 59 of the committee report that there was no appropriation whatever in 1952 for this item, and I see that for 1953 the entire amount is a new appropriation. It has plus \$16,481,000. I just do not think this is any time to be taking on new appropriations and that is why I support the Williams amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. We had this matter before us in connection with a motion made by the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], I think. I was surprised, as the gentleman from Georgia was, to find that this is a new appropriation. Possibly the gentleman from California could clear that up.

[Mr. JACKSON of California addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I think the figures have been gone into in the colloquy here. The law which this appropriation responds to, which is the

Mutual Security Act, we just passed, states that the contributions to the U. N. Children's Fund shall be made until December 31, 1953. That is what this \$16,000,000 covers, in other words not a year but a year and a half. I again read from the law:

Provided, That the contributions shall be made in such a manner as to give assurance that they will not exceed 33⅓ percent of contributions from all governments, including contributions made by governments for the benefit of persons located within territories under their control.

So that there can be no money expended unless it be on the one-third basis, except that my colleague from Mississippi makes the point that the application of the one-third includes contributions made by governments for the benefit of all persons under their control, and in this case that means significantly, children.

I think he is trying to cut this thing—I think that is clear from the figures—even more than he would want to cut it when he asked to cut it down to \$6,000,000. That is about one-third of \$20,000,000, the one year's budget, while a year and a half's budget would be \$30,000,000 and called for \$10,000,000 even on his formula. The American delegation which dealt with this subject at the United Nations General Assembly, generally speaking, wanted this program continued by the specialized agencies of the U. N. acting directly without continuing UNICEF. Nevertheless, the great preponderance of U. N. members wanted it continued. We felt as a matter of our standing in the world that we could not afford, where we were dealing with children, to stay out of UNICEF. That is why we had to go into it.

The UNICEF program is helping directly 42,000,000 children in the world. It covers them in terms of maternal and child welfare. It covers them in terms of health, for example, combating insect-borne disease in areas in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. It covers them especially and significantly in terms of child-feeding assistance.

It seems to me this is a question of policy with respect to our standing in the world to cooperate with other nations in the United Nations in a program which in this case they consider most important. We would like to see it carried on by other agencies, but the great bulk of the nations in the world want us to play ball with them in this case. They would like to carry this program on in this organization UNICEF through the United Nations, so we are agreeing to contribute, according to this bill and according to the enabling legislation, one-third, in order to play with them in return for other cases where we ask that they play with us. I think it is a wise investment.

There is offered hereto the budget program for fiscal 1952-53 taken out of the report entitled "United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund—Report of Executive Board"—April 22-24, 1952—Economic and Social Council official records; fourteenth session:

II. Target program and budget for period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953

I. SUMMARY BY AREA

	Total target budget (thousand dollars)
Africa.....	1,710
Asia.....	5,630
Eastern Mediterranean.....	1,850
Europe.....	750
Latin America.....	2,460
Projects benefiting more than one region.....	500
Emergency situations.....	3,000
Freight.....	2,100
Administration.....	2,000
Total.....	20,000

II. SUMMARY BY PROGRAMS

1. Maternal and child welfare:	
A. Supplies and equipment for basic MCW programs:	
(a) Supplies for MCW centers....	2,335
(b) School health services.....	150
(c) Other projects.....	340
B. Training programs.....	780
C. Mass health programs:	
(a) Combating insect-borne diseases.....	2,090
(b) Production of antibiotics, insecticides, sera, and vaccine.....	830
(c) Control of bejel, yaws, and VD.....	800
(d) BCG antituberculosis vaccination campaigns.....	570
(e) Antitrachoma work.....	570
(f) Control of other communicable diseases.....	100
2. Child feeding:	
A. Long-range feeding assistance..	1,655
B. Milk-conservation projects.....	1,700
3. Projects benefiting more than one region.....	500
4. Emergency situations.....	3,000
5. Freight.....	2,100
6. Administration.....	2,000
Total.....	20,000

III. SUMMARY BY AREA AND PROGRAM

Africa	
1. Maternal and child welfare:	
C. Mass health programs:	
(a) Combating insect-borne diseases.....	755
(c) Control of bejel, yaws, and VD.....	25
(d) BCG.....	100
(f) Antitrachoma work.....	200
2. Child feeding:	
A. Long-range feeding assistance..	630
Total.....	1,710
Asia	
1. Maternal and child welfare:	
A. Supplies and equipment for basic MCW programs:	
(a) Supplies for MCW centers..	1,535
B. Training programs.....	550
C. Mass health programs:	
(a) Combating insect-borne diseases.....	775
(b) Production of antibiotics, insecticides, sera, and vaccine.....	500
(c) Control of bejel, yaws, and VD.....	725
(d) BCG.....	600
(f) Antitrachoma work.....	100
(g) Control of other communicable diseases.....	100

Asia—Continued	
	Total target budget (thousand dollars)
2. Child feeding:	
A. Long-range feeding assistance---	545
B. Milk conservation projects-----	200
Total-----	5,630
Eastern Mediterranean	
1. Maternal and child welfare:	
A. Supplies and equipment for basic MCW programs:	
(a) Supplies for MCW centers---	205
(d) Other projects-----	210
B. Training programs-----	125
C. Mass health programs:	
(a) Combating insect-borne diseases-----	260
(d) BCG-----	100
(f) Antitrachoma work-----	150
2. Child feeding:	
A. Long-range feeding assistance---	150
B. Milk-conservation projects-----	650
Total-----	1,850
Europe	
1. Maternal and child welfare:	
A. Supplies and equipment for basic MCW programs:	
(a) Supplies for MCW centers---	200
(b) School health services-----	50
(d) Other projects-----	130
C. Mass health programs:	
(e) Control of bejel yaws, and VD-----	50
(f) Antitrachoma work-----	120
2. Child feeding:	
B. Milk conservation projects-----	200
Total-----	750
Latin America	
1. Maternal and child welfare:	
A. Supplies and equipment for basic MCW programs:	
(a) Supplies for MCW centers---	395
(b) School health services-----	100
B. Training programs-----	105
C. Mass health programs:	
(a) Combating insect-borne diseases-----	300
(b) Production of antibiotics, insecticides, sera, and vaccine-----	330
(d) BCG-----	250
2. Child feeding:	
A. Long-range feeding assistance---	330
B. Milk conservation projects-----	650
Total-----	2,460
Projects benefiting more than one region-----	500
Emergency situations-----	3,000
Freight-----	2,100
Administration-----	2,000
Total-----	20,000

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this program is one which was not included in the Budget request but was inserted by the Senate and the House in the authorizing legislation.

The same situation applies to this organization as applies to the other organizations to which we are contributing. Consequently, our contribution is less than 33 1/3 percent of the total amount spent.

Several years ago this question was before the House. At that time there was on the board, or connected with this organization in some way, a Communist from Poland, and the House refused an appropriation because of that fact. The

organization has now been completely freed from Communist influence. There are no Communists connected with it in any manner, shape or form.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. I wanted to ask the gentleman about the \$500,000 for global projects.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I did not have a chance to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 96, noes 99.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and Mr. McGRATH.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 119, noes 92.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title for economic or technical assistance and allocations from any appropriations to the Director for Mutual Security, or the Mutual Security Agency, or the Department of State, shall be available, without limitation on any authority conferred by the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, or any act continued in effect thereby, for rents in the District of Columbia; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of such appropriations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to exceed two aircraft for use outside the continental limits of the United States and maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft; purchase of not to exceed 20 passenger motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the United States and, in addition, passenger motor vehicles abroad may be exchanged or sold and replaced for an equal number of such vehicles; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed \$20,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543); loss by exchange; expenditures (not to exceed \$50,000) of a confidential character other than entertainment provided that a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure, the nature of which it is considered inadvisable to specify, shall be made by the Director or Deputy Director of Mutual Security, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein specified; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; acquisition of quarters outside the continental limits of the United States to house employees of the United States Government by rental (without regard to sec. 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, purchase, or construction, and necessary repairs and alternations to such quarters; health and accident insurance for foreign trainees and technicians while en route or absent from their own countries participating in activities authorized under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes in the United States or elsewhere the remains of persons or members of the families of persons who may die while such persons are away from their homes participating in ac-

tivities under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended; and services of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for the purposes of providing such services the Public Health Service may appoint not to exceed 20 officers in the Regular Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance with section 711 of the Act of July 1, 1944, as amended (42 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey may appoint for such purposes not to exceed 20 commissioned officers in addition to those otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$42,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the departments and agencies concerned with the administration of the programs provided for herein and no part of such amount shall be used to pay the salary of any civilian employee at a rate greater than that paid by the State Department for comparable work or services in the same area: *Provided further*, That agricultural products or products produced from agricultural products purchased or obtained under this program shall be at not less than the average market price prevailing for such commodity or commodities within the United States or the support price for such commodity or commodities, whichever is the greater.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIBICOFF: On page 36, line 10, strike out "\$42,000,000" and insert "\$40,265,000."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman—
Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.
Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, the last 5 reserved to the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the Mutual Security Program. I would like to see it more effective. Studies at home and abroad have convinced me that the Mutual Security Program is overstuffed, overorganized, and a constant irritant to our friends abroad because of this. In touring abroad looking into this problem for the Foreign Affairs Committee there was one factor upon which there was unanimous agreement, and this agreement came not only from newspapermen who had covered the area but also from the most efficient, effective, and knowledgeable Americans who have participated in these programs, as well as representatives of foreign governments; and that was that we had so many Americans abroad that they were getting in each other's way and consequently bringing much ill will toward the United States of America.

Further study indicates that there are over 46,000 people who are accredited to the various mutual security pro-

grams; in excess of 10,000 people are in the administrative end.

One of the troubles of this administrative set-up is that they are getting in the way of the policy makers. Some of them are merely paper shufflers who ensnare with red tape the people who are trying to formulate policy and make the policy more effective.

I had offered an amendment cutting the administrative staff to the extent of 15 percent in the Foreign Affairs Committee. The committee itself approved a 10-percent cut. This House approved the 10-percent cut in the administrative personnel. In conference the authorization bill provided for only a 5-percent cut. The Appropriations Committee accepted the reduction amendment of 5 percent and added an additional 5 percent. This amendment represents another 5-percent cut, and this 5-percent cut will cut 15 percent off of the 10,000 people in the administrative end. It is my belief that because of this we will have a better, more streamlined, and effective agency, an agency that will be in a position better to administer the laws and the policies of the United States of America. Consequently, I ask the House to adopt the amendment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would like to point out to the gentleman that there are some 2,000 military personnel assigned to civilian positions whose salaries and expenses are paid for out of regular Defense Department funds amounting perhaps to fifteen to twenty million dollars, and, in addition to that, there are payments for services performed by other agencies amounting to some \$19,000,000 and representing perhaps over 3,500 people, not enumerated in the hearings.

I am glad the gentleman has offered this amendment. It is a very moderate amendment, I think. In my judgment, this agency has been overstaffed for several years, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time, only if permissible, to ask a question with reference to the previous Williams amendment which applied to this UNICEF program; you have an item in there: global provisions, \$500,000. Could the gentleman explain what that is?

Mr. GARY. I am sorry, I cannot. That is a program of the UNICEF organization.

Mr. GAVIN. Maybe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] can answer about that authorization of \$500,000 for this global project.

Mr. VORYS. I do not know. They have a whole lot of global projects. They have a program that is far larger than they have ever gotten money for. That has been their practice, and I do not know about that item.

Mr. GAVIN. Is there anybody on either side who can tell me what the \$500,000 is for? I am merely trying to

prove to you that you are spending a lot of money, you are voting a lot of money, but nobody can tell us about a \$500,000 item. Now, a \$500,000 item back in my district is a lot of money. If you want to spend \$500,000 somebody should know about it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I have the detailed breakdown of their budgetary program for the year July 1952 to July 1953. I will put this text in the RECORD, which breaks down in detail everything for which they are spending money. I do not know what paper the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The paper that the gentleman holds in his hand is a page out of the budget justification which was sent to the Appropriations Committee by the Mutual Security Agency.

Mr. JAVITS. I have a report of the executive board of the U. N. Children's Fund that spells out in dollars and cents every item budgeted in every area, and I will put it in the RECORD. It does not contain anything about global projects.

Mr. GAVIN. Nothing about this global project? Nobody can tell me anything about this global project involving \$500,000? Well, gentlemen, this is an unusual situation, where we appropriate \$500,000 on a global project which no one seems to be able to explain or justify.

Mr. JAVITS. The proposed total UNICEF target budget for the period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, amounts to \$20,000,000 distributed as follows:

By area:	
Africa.....	\$1,710,000
Asia.....	4,630,000
Eastern Mediterranean.....	1,850,000
Europe.....	750,000
Latin America.....	2,460,000
Global projects.....	500,000
Emergency situations.....	4,000,000
Freight.....	2,100,000
Administration.....	2,000,000
Total.....	20,000,000

By project:	
Supplies and equipment for basic maternal and child welfare programs.....	2,375,000
Maternal and child welfare training programs.....	780,000
Maternal and child welfare mass health programs.....	5,090,000
Feeding, including milk conservation.....	3,155,000
Global projects.....	500,000
Emergency situations.....	4,000,000
Freight.....	2,100,000
Administration.....	2,000,000
Total.....	20,000,000

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am going to oppose this amendment, but, for the RECORD, I would like to say that if you want to vote out a lot of Republican job holders, the best thing for you to do is to support this amendment. I have visited nearly every mutual security office in the world, I think, and if

there is a Democrat employed by either the former ECA or by the Mutual Security Administration I have not found him yet any place on either the MSA or ECA payroll. I say to my Republican friends, why you want to vote to cut down the payroll that has been designated by the Republican national committee I do not know, but that is up to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of confusion and misunderstanding about the cuts that have been made in administrative expenses. In the first place, it is claimed by some that the budget estimates do not adequately reflect in terms of dollars the 5-percent cut in numbers of personnel prescribed by the authorizing legislation. This conclusion is in error as the following figures will show. Originally personnel services were set at \$37,800,000. Five percent of this amount is \$1,800,000 on an annual basis. In the estimates presented to the Appropriations Committee, \$1,735,000 was cut from the administrative expenses by the executive branch. This is less than the \$1,800,000 figure mentioned above but is, in fact, more than 5 percent of the personnel costs in the budget. This is so because the cut is not to be effective until 90 days after June 20 (the effective date of the bill). Thus the cut will apply to only 9 months instead of 12 months. In addition, large terminal leave payments will be required to be paid to those who are dismissed.

In addition to the \$1,735,000 cut in the administrative expenses proposed by the executive branch, the committee further reduced administrative expenses by \$1,790,000. The net result, therefore, is a total cut from the original estimate of \$3,500,000, which is \$1,250,000 more than 5 percent of the \$45,000,000 total estimate of administrative expenses for the full year.

Now, let us take a few moments to discuss the effect of a further reduction in personnel or funds on the operating agencies carrying out this program. We will start with the Department of Defense.

Probably everyone will concede that the expenses of the Department of Defense in administering this program will depend chiefly on the amount of equipment to be produced and delivered to our allies abroad. The best estimates obtainable indicate that deliveries of matériel during fiscal year 1953 will greatly increase as American industry begins to achieve maximum production and long-lead items ordered since the inception of the mutual defense assistance program start coming off production lines in volume. It would follow, therefore, that the Department of Defense rather than reducing personnel should be increasing personnel assigned to this program.

In addition, this program contemplates delivery of matériel to several countries during fiscal year 1953 which have not heretofore received military assistance. These countries include Spain, Germany, and six Latin-Ameri-

can countries. With such an increase in recipient nations the requirements of the Department of Defense are actually increased since military missions will have to be assigned to the countries to insure proper use of the equipment and matériel delivered to them, as well as to conduct training of military personnel who will use the matériel when it is received.

Next, let us consider the effect of a further reduction on the Mutual Security Agency. I should like to remind the Members of the House that the Mutual Security Act of 1951 required this agency to cut personnel 10 percent below August 31, 1950, levels by January 1, 1952. The Mutual Security Act of 1952 requires a further reduction of 5 percent in the number of such personnel. This further cut comes at a time when expanded responsibilities for stepping up military production in allied countries and a greatly increased offshore procurement program must be undertaken, requiring the Mutual Security Agency to bend every effort to assist the Department of Defense in achieving effective utilization of the production facilities of Europe.

Let us pass now to the Technical Cooperation Administration of the Department of State. This program, as you all know, is in the process of assuming increased responsibilities in fiscal year 1953. Bilateral negotiations with many of the countries involved have only just been consummated. At this time United States technicians should be dispatched to undertake the aid programs for the respective countries. These technicians cannot operate without effective backstopping from the TCA headquarters in Washington. If the provisions of section 504 (d) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, were to be applied agency by agency, the Technical Cooperation Administration would have to dismiss 5 percent of the personnel employed in Washington as of June 1 to provide this backstopping.

So much for the probable effect of a further reduction on the agencies involved. Let us now consider the wisdom of refusing the executive branch the relatively small amount of money required for the effective administration of this multibillion-dollar program. Truly, this is a case of false economy and false economy is no economy. The effectiveness of our aid program depends as much on the quality and adequacy of its administration as on the funds made available. The purpose of the aid program is to develop strong allies capable of joining us in resisting aggression. Our aid gives us a powerful lever in exerting leadership throughout the world for the purpose of building strength. Such leadership, however, cannot be exerted without a capable and adequate staff which has the means of obtaining the vast amounts of information necessary for the purpose, and has people qualified to take a position of leadership in the many countries in which the program operates. The surest way to get as little as possible for the large amounts of money devoted to this program is to have it administered by an inadequate

staff. Even if the staff were excessive, which on the basis of testimony given is not the case, it would be far better to err on this side than to cut the staff down to the point where it could not effectively administer the program. Savings of a few million dollars in administrative expenses would, in my judgment, mean waste in the program of many times this amount. I urge that the House not adopt this short-sighted and self-defeating course.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. RIBICOFF: On page 36, line 10, strike out "40,265,000" and insert "\$37,800,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 101, noes 72.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on lines 16 to 22 on page 36 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. That language is as follows:

Provided further, That agricultural products or products produced from agricultural products purchased or obtained under this program shall be at not less than the average market price prevailing for such commodity or commodities within the United States or the support price for such commodity or commodities, whichever is the greater.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I was the author of that language in the bill. I confess that it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman concede the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 36, line 16, after the colon insert the following: *Provided further*, That no part of such funds shall be expended for the purchase of agricultural products or products produced from agricultural products not declared to be in short supply in the United States by the Secretary of Agriculture at less than the prevailing market price for such commodity within the United States or, if obtained from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, at less than the support price of such commodity including handling and storage costs."

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to correct a bad practice in the operation of the foreign-aid program. The Congress has provided for the Mutual Security Program and before that the ECA. Then funds have been provided for such programs. Through the years, both under the Marshall plan operations and under Mutual Security program, in the purchase of many commodities in the United States, and particularly from the Commodity Credit Corporation, they have required that they be sold below cost and the difference be made up from section 32 funds. Not only that but many times United States funds have been used to purchase commodities from other countries, wheat from Canada for instance, when such wheat was readily available in our own country.

Through the demand by aided countries for prices below cost not only have we sold commodities for about \$65,000-000 below the cost to us, but in effect you have increased ECA and mutual security aid by such \$65,000,000. Doubtless many of you were not aware of this fact. This provision will prohibit that practice. It also will strengthen the hands of those in Mutual Security who want these countries to pay the amount of money that we have invested in such commodities, or the prevailing market price because as long as they have the authority to use section 32 funds, to make up any discount, the countries aided of course will urge such sale below cost. I think the amendment should be adopted for that reason. In addition, in the Mutual Security Program, we have provided that if commodities are surplus in our country, then they must be purchased in the United States if United States funds are expended. This amendment would have the additional purpose of saying that if commodities are readily available in the United States, and we are putting up the money, in the judgment of the Congress then, they should be purchased here. That is not a flat requirement because if the Secretary of Agriculture should certify that such commodities are in short supply in the United States, then this provision would not apply. I might add further that I have taken this provision up with officials of the Mutual Security Agency, and I feel that I have met the major objections they have raised to the language which was in the bill, and which was subject to a point of order. I feel there can be no question but what the membership should support this amendment and stop on the one hand a bad practice and on the other spell out the policy which should be followed where we are providing the funds. When we have the commodities available preference should be given to using our funds to buy such commodities at the prevailing price in this country, or at the support price in case they come from the Commodity Credit Corporation. I believe the amendment should be adopted.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ESA

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, in voting on the appropriation for the Economic Stabilization Agency, I think we should be guided by the Biblical maxim

that the laborer is worthy of his hire. By passing the extension of the Defense Production Act, we have told the stabilizers to administer these controls, and of all the appropriations we pass upon here—this one above all—is no place for false economy. On this one, of all places, we shouldn't be tempted to chisel away just because their job is a thankless one. For every 1 percent of price increase that these people save our economy, it means an annual saving of \$800,000,000 in our Federal expenditures. On this score alone, you can see why the comparatively small amount of \$80,000,000 should be restored to this appropriation to make sure they have enough to do an effective job. Besides this governmental saving, the prevention of a 1-percent price rise means an annual saving of \$2,000,000,000 in the cost of living for 150,000,000 voters. You can be sure that we will hear from these voters if we allow their cost of living to rise any higher than it has already gone due to loopholes provided by weakening amendments to the Defense Production Act.

When the bill for the extension of the Defense Production Act was up on the floor here, the opponents of controls—who did not dare take the responsibility for voting to kill the controls outright—sought time and again to kill the controls indirectly—by putting forward innocent-sounding, but deadly amendments. I hope the conference report on the Defense Production Act will be accepted by the House. For then we will have a law which is not as good as it might be but which still can offer substantial protection against the ravages of inflation. That is to say, the law can hold down inflation if it is enforced by an adequate staff.

But at this point the opponents of controls are trying to repeat their flank maneuver by seeking to slash the appropriation—to slash it in the name of governmental economy.

I yield to no one in my desire for governmental economy, but I say to you that those who seek to cut the appropriation for economic controls are not true advocates of economy. They are advocates of waste and extravagance. For there is nothing that can waste Government procurement appropriations as fast as giving a free rein to inflation.

And let us not forget that at the same time that inflation wastes Government appropriations, it wastes the incomes of our 50,000,000 families along with the economic strength of the Nation.

The father of world communism, Lenin, is reported have said that the best way to destroy a nation is by destroying the value of its money—in other words—inflation. And it is very evident from recent Communist statements that they are counting on inflation in America to sap our economic strength and thereby sap our military strength.

I think the Communists are going to be proved wrong in counting on the inability of this Congress to hold inflation just as they were proved wrong in counting on a great depression to wreck the American economy during the period before their attack on Korea. Right here and now on this floor—right here

and now on this appropriations bill, we have a chance to prove the Kremlin wrong. We can prove that we have the courage and self-restraint to curb the natural desires of higher profits and higher wages in the interest of stopping inflation. We must remember that every fight amongst ourselves on the details of how to accomplish stabilization, which results in weakening our inflation controls, automatically helps to make the Kremlin's predictions and hopes come true.

I do not think we want to do that. I think it is right and proper that we scrutinize every appropriation request carefully and see that it does not contain any unnecessary fat. I have sought to satisfy myself as to whether the budgetary request makes sufficient allowance for the suspension of ceilings in soft markets. I have found that the OPS, which is the organization making these suspensions, is practically a skeleton compared to the OPA staff during the last war. The fact that it will function as a shrunken organization can be seen when we compare its staff with that of OPA in World War II. It will be 10,750 for OPS against almost 65,000 for OPA in total. Allowing for the fact that OPA had roughly 38,000 of their 65,000 people devoted to rationing and rent, this leaves OPS with 60 percent less personnel for their comparable function.

We must also remember that one-half of all consumer prices are now at peak levels, and another 20 percent are within 2 percent of peak levels. Seven out of every ten dollars being spent by consumers are being spent on goods at or very near ceilings. Only about 10 percent of all prices are substantially below ceiling and can really be considered as "soft."

So, it is crystal clear that the OPS budget has already more than taken care of reduced workloads attributable to suspensions already taken or likely to be taken. It also must be noted that every one of the suspension actions imposes upon OPS the responsibility of watching price developments in the market area under suspension, so that the suspension of a particular commodity does not mean that all work in connection with that commodity ceases.

Now, of course, every Member of Congress knows that there has been a lot of criticism of both slow processing and work backlog in some of the offices of this agency on the one hand, and also criticism of overstaffing in field offices on the other hand. But, we all know the terrific handicaps under which these people are working, and I am sure that all the Members of Congress who have dealt with the various offices of this agency on our constituents' matters must have some appreciation of the problems involved in this agency, as compared to permanent Government departments.

In the first place, they have had the problem of setting up temporary staffs in a great hurry where it is difficult to accurately gauge workload. Quite aside from the normal mix-ups inherent to this sort of situation, it is difficult for a temporary agency to get competent people to serve in work which has absolutely no future or security to it. The business

people in the agencies are there largely out of the sense of patriotic duty and the same goes for the Government career people. There is nothing more unpopular than telling people that they cannot have higher prices, wages, or salaries.

Their second problem is a terrific organizational one. They are dealing with very comprehensive subjects requiring experts in the various industrial specialties and skills which comprise an amazing array of all the distinctions present in our vast economy. Not only this, but all their regulations must be interpreted and applied to any individual or business who has questions or a problem.

Their third problem is an operational one which I am sure all of us can see would be present in any agency which has to quickly set up personnel for handling four operations as vast as these. It is that of shifting workloads and emphasis on the various programs, as well as the geographic distinctions in field offices. This is the problem that causes too much personnel in one office, and not enough personnel to handle the processing case loads in other offices. It just takes time for them to adjust to their problems, some of which change from day to day depending upon economic fluctuations.

I could go into great detail on all of these three scores, but I know each and every Member of this body must know exactly what I am talking about from his own experience and dealings with the four different branches of this agency and the manifold problems with which they must deal.

The cost of living is again at almost the highest point in history. Millions of low- and fixed-income families are hard hit by present prices and rents, as well as by the burden of high taxes. They are looking to us to keep the cost of living and the cost of defense, which must be met by taxes, from rising any further. A vote to provide an adequate appropriation for the administration of economic controls will reassure them as to our intention of holding the line. A vote to slash this appropriation any further will weaken our anti-inflation efforts to a crippling extent. It is as obvious to the voters as it must be to us that no law can be either adequately or equitably enforced without both sufficient and capable manpower. It will add to our people's unrest at a time when we should all be rallying our forces to meet the economic as well as the military challenge of Communist aggression.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

This chapter may be cited as the "Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1953."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 37, after line 2 insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. (a) No part of any appropriation made by this act for any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal services in excess of an amount equal to 85 percent of the amount requested for personal services

for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for the payment of personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 15 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for personal services for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

"(b) This section shall not apply to—

"(1) not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(2) positions filled from within the Mutual Security Agency and related Government functions provided for in this act;

"(3) offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

Provided further, That subsection (1) of paragraph (b) shall operate to accomplish the provisions of paragraph (a), and the said 85 percent shall not be exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953; and *Provided further*, each agency shall impound and deposit in the general fund of the Treasury as soon as practicable, but not less frequently than quarterly, an amount equivalent to the savings resulting from the vacant positions, which are prohibited from being filled by this section, based on the salaries of the prior incumbents of the positions."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. The amendment applies to the act and should be placed at the end of the act, rather than at the end of the chapter which we are now considering. I wonder if the gentleman will not withdraw the amendment at this time, and offer it at the conclusion of the act.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). The Chair is ready to rule.

The language contained in this amendment might well appear at any part of the act. It is not of such a nature that it must come at the conclusion of the measure now under consideration. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change the word "act" in the first line of section A to "chapter," making the amendment read:

No part of any appropriation made by this chapter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment with which the membership is familiar. It is a like amendment to the other amendments which I have offered to five appropriation bills, and which this House has already adopted during this session and last session.

This amendment provides that the personnel provided for in this bill shall be reduced by not less than 15 percent. The reason I have offered this amendment to this bill is because of the fact that we hear from all who visit foreign countries in which this Mutual Security Program is operating that they are overstaffed no end; that most of these employees in foreign countries are taken

care of like kings; that they have valets, housemaids, housemen, chauffeurs, at their service. I have been reliably informed that on an average each one of these employees in the Mutual Security Program is actually costing the taxpayers of America well over \$10,000 per annum. We pay their way across the seas, we pay the way of their families and so forth and it must stop sometime. We are setting a very poor example to the peoples of the world whom we are trying to help. Now if you want to save about \$16,630,000 in the fiscal year 1953 here is your chance. It takes no one off the payroll. It simply provides that only one vacancy out of four may be filled until the 15 percent reduction in personnel has been accomplished. By so doing we hope finally to get this overstaffing in all departments down to the point that the American people can afford to pay.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. Does this in any way affect the consular staff working at Montreal, Canada?

Mr. JENSEN. If they are getting money out of the Mutual Security Program, surely it would.

Mr. SADLAK. Apparently they are understaffed there, because I have directed an air-mail inquiry to the American Consul at Montreal on June 12, and to this time I have not had an acknowledgment. Apparently they would need more help. However I do not believe this House or the American people are in the mood to spend more than \$13,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1953 for personnel hire just to be governed from Washington, D. C.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIBICOFF to the amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: After (b), No. 3, add a new paragraph as follows:

"4. That 90 days after the enactment of this act, the number of civilian employees who are United States citizens, receiving compensation or allowances from the administrative expense appropriations provided by this act, employed in the United States and overseas by or assigned to the Mutual Security Agency, or employed by or assigned to the Department of State or the Department of Defense for carrying out programs the appropriations for which are provided by this act, and the military personnel assigned to such programs, shall be in the aggregate at least 15 percent less than the number so employed or assigned on June 1, 1952, except for such personnel of the Department of Defense engaged in the manufacturing, repair, rehabilitation, packing, handling, crating, or delivery of matériel: *Provided further*, That after the Director has determined the reduction to be effected in each agency, the determination as to which individual employees shall be retained shall be made by the head of the agency concerned."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to clarify the Jensen amendment in accordance with the very careful draftsmanship of the Foreign Affairs Committee to make sure that the separation of the 15 percent would proceed in an orderly fashion, and also to make certain that we

can have capable people on the staffs, and not the drones. I think the amendment in this respect is a clarifying one and will help the program.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to say that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who offered this amendment, spoke to me about his amendment, explained it to me, and I can understand that it is necessary in this particular agency; so I shall be in favor and will support the gentleman's amendment to my amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut, my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and my colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for getting together on this front to have an orderly system for cutting down that payroll, but keeping enough necessary to run the agencies. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia make his point of order?

Mr. GARY. Yes. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment, it leaves the discharge of employees entirely to the Administrator, which contravenes existing laws with reference to veterans' preference and also the civil-service laws. It is legislation; it contravenes existing legislation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late; the amendment had been debated.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I reserved the point of order at the time the amendment was offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Part of the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, after the proviso, reads:

That after the Director has determined the reduction to be effected in each agency, the determination as to which individual employees shall be retained shall be made by the head of the agency concerned.

This portion of the amendment does, in the opinion of the Chair, alter the civil-service laws and laws relating to veterans' preferences, and therefore constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 124, noes 83.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I prepared an amendment I was going to offer at the end of this particular chapter which I want to read because I desire to get the thought across to the Members. The amendment reads:

Provided, further, That funds provided in this chapter shall not be available for expenditure abroad where United States Government owned funds or credits are avail-

able for the purposes of this chapter and where the expenditure of the same would not create an undue economic strain on the country concerned.

The reason I am not offering the amendment is that the language requires a great deal more consideration in order to accomplish the purpose desired.

I want to call attention to page 858 of the hearings, where are listed the various balances outstanding that have been obtained from lend-lease, surplus property, and pipeline. You will see that the total amount of funds that we have available to us abroad is \$2,200,000,000 approximately. That money has been sitting there for some time, of course, and could be utilized for mutual defense.

I call attention to the report and the consideration that we gave to the Foreign Service Building Act which came before this House on March 31, 1952, and to some of the statements made by the proponents of that act.

I will read from a special order that I had on April 1, in which I discussed this matter, page 3375, April 1, 1952, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The Members were told that it would cost the taxpayers of this country no money; the Members were told that the payments would come out of funds which this country might easily lose if we did not convert the funds into real estate abroad; the Members were told that we would save money on rent if we authorized the State Department to spend this \$90,000,000. All three of these statements are unfounded, on either study or fact.

The fact remains that all of this appropriation of some six or seven billion dollars actually does not have to come out of the taxpayers' pockets if we would utilize this some \$2,200,000,000 worth of funds that are available abroad and not listen to the statements that the State Department has made in the past that those funds cannot be used, because they can be used.

Furthermore, I want to call your attention to page 14 of the hearings on this foreign building program.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I make the point of order that the House is not in order.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would like to say that I am doing this after conferring with the chairman of the subcommittee. He suggested that I take 5 minutes to try to explain this very important matter to the House, because he himself feels that this should be gone into, and he hopes the subcommittee will go into it and be able to come up with some language in the future whereby we can pin these people down and make them use these some \$2,200,000,000 worth of sums available abroad, and if the gentleman from Ohio is no more interested in the taxpayer than his remarks indicate, I suggest that he refrain from making statements on the floor to that effect.

What I was trying to point out, in the hearings on the foreign-service build-

ing, on page 14, the State Department has previously said that these funds are tied down in different countries, and therefore you cannot switch them one country to another. But, in a little sub-note 4 on that page you will find this statement:

Insufficient foreign credits are currently available to complete FBO program plans. It is anticipated that adequate credits will be acquired through subsequent agreements transfers from other countries and/or purchase of necessary materials and equipment in other countries where credits are available.

So you notice when they come before us to get money, \$90,000,000 for this, they know how to switch these funds around from one country to another. This is \$2,200,000,000 that we could utilize to a certain extent for this mutual-security program and actually save our taxpayers a considerable amount of this \$6,000,000,000 that we are adding on in this appropriation.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of announcing to the House the death of a former colleague from the second district of Philadelphia, the Honorable Robert N. McGarvey, who passed away this afternoon. Bob McGarvey represented the West Philadelphia district in the Eightieth Congress. Many of you will remember him as a lovable, alert little bantam of a man who held strong convictions, but who was amiable and beloved by both sides of the aisle. He used to sit just back of the terminal or "anchor" seat of the Pennsylvania delegation occupied by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]. Many of us will miss him and will recall with sadness his passing. Our sincere condolences are extended to his family and to his many friends. I would like to say this as my own tribute to him, that although the years inevitably demanded their toll, he seemed perpetually youthful and full of interest in the passing scene, "he shall grow not old as we that are left grow old. Age shall not weary him, nor the years condemn; at the going down of the sun, and in the morning we shall remember him."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would certainly be derelict if I were not to say a word on the passing of this former colleague of ours who came here and associated with us. We found him to be a quiet, modest man; diffident, yet very earnest and very sincere; a man utterly devoted to his country and its needs; very thoughtful of his colleagues; all in all, a genuine Christian man. We shall miss him very much.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I join with the other Pennsylvania Members in express-

ing my regret and sorrow on hearing of the death of our former colleague, Mr. McGarvey. He was a perfect gentleman in every respect. He was as true to the proper principles for the guidance of any legislator as any who ever served in this House. He deserves credit for the service he gave to the country. I am sure we all mourn his passing, and express our sincere sympathy to his relatives and friends.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I am happy to testify, from my knowledge of Bob McGarvey, to his integrity, rectitude, and unswerving loyalty to his friends and associates regardless of their political affiliations. Certainly the Democratic delegation from Philadelphia grieve his passing.

May I say also that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRANAHAN], from the district which Mr. McGarvey represented, would, if he were here today, also express his sorrow at the passing of our colleague.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I have spoken to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRANAHAN], and he has expressed to me his intention to pay his respects to the memory of our late colleague.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN. I join my colleagues from Pennsylvania in expressing sympathy to the family of Bob McGarvey. He was an outstanding figure in Philadelphia. He served here in a very exemplary way, and was one of the outstanding Members of the Eightieth Congress. I express my personal sympathy to his family and loved ones.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER X

EMERGENCY AGENCIES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

For expenses necessary for the Office of Defense Mobilization, including compensation of the Director of Defense Mobilization, at the rate of \$22,500 per annum; printing and binding without regard to section 89 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U. S. C. 213); hire of passenger-motor vehicles; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That contracts under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), may be renewed annually.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 37, line 9, which reads, "at the rate

of \$22,500 per annum." It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] a question. I understand the controls bill is to operate for 10 months. I wonder why under those circumstances there should not be a reduction of one-sixth in each one of the items that appear in chapter X.

Mr. WHITTEN. These figures were arrived at, as the gentleman knows, only today because we had to wait and see what was contained in this conference report, which has not yet been up. We do feel with regard to the two items, which are for the first time in the conference report on a 10-month basis, approximately one-sixth of the amounts involved here should be retained for the last 2 months for clean-up purposes or for the doing away with the agency which is required by the law. It is my understanding insofar as this particular part of the appropriation bill is concerned, it is only on a 12-month basis and is not within the 10-month limitation under the agreement reached in conference. Therefore, it would be on a 12-month basis.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman. The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE TRANSPORT ADMINISTRATION
Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the Defense Transport Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$2,200,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 38, line 20, before the period, insert "Provided, That this appropriation shall be available for not to exceed four contracts for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), which may be renewed annually."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this language has been agreed upon by both sides. It does not increase the amount of money to be expended by the Defense Transportation group, but it will permit them to use specialists in this field not to exceed four, for the purposes of counsel and advice in this operation. As I say, it is my understanding that this has been agreed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION
Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the Small Defense Plants Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned

with the purposes of this appropriation, and purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$3,500,000.

Revolving fund

For the revolving fund authorized by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, \$3,000,000.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION A ONE-STOP AGENCY FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of legislation extending the functions of the Small Defense Plants Administration for another year is testimony of the determination of the Congress to provide equal opportunity for the small-business institutions of our Nation during these trying times.

It is gratifying to the House Small Business Committee to have the recommendations of our great Committee on Appropriations adopted unanimously by the House.

These two necessary steps on the part of the House of Representatives and the Congress will enable the Small Defense Plants Administration to continue the effective programs now under way. I said in proposing the original legislation that SDPA was intended to be a one-stop agency for small business. That concept has been accepted by those in charge of the administration of this agency without reservation.

I want you to know the House Small Business Committee is watching over the operations of SDPA for you. It is your agency, an independent one, jointly sponsored by most of the Members of this House. The members of the House Small Business Committee have felt their responsibility in this regard. It is our intention after the adjournment of this session to continue to follow carefully the administration of SDPA in every particular and report our findings and conclusions to the House.

I have every reason to believe your confidence in establishing SDPA as a one-stop agency for small business will be fully justified.

At this point, I desire to include statements of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, House Report 2177, dated June 16, 1952, to accompany H. R. 8210, Eighty-second Congress, second session; the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, Senate Report 1599, dated May 27, 1952, to accompany S. 2594, Eighty-second Congress, second session; the Committee on Appropriations of the House, House Report 2316 on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1953, chapter X, emergency agencies; and finally, a statement of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President, Senate Report 1295, dated March 12, 1952, Eighty-second Congress, second session. It is extremely gratifying to me as chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, to the members of the committee, and to small business across the Nation that the Small Defense Plants Administration has received the strong support of these important standing committees of both the House and the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
House of Representatives.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF
1952 (H. REPT. 2177 ON H. R. 8210)

The Small Defense Plants Administration (SDPA) was established under section 714 of the act, which was added by the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951. Its function is to carry out the policy of the Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of the act.

Section 714f (2) sets up a procedure for carrying out jointly by SDPA and the procurement agencies the congressional policy that a fair proportion of total Government purchases and contracts be awarded to small business. SDPA has been engaged in putting this procedure into effect, by arrangements with the armed services and other procurement agencies. Under this plan, procurement requests will be screened for work which can be done by small concerns, and an appropriate portion of the procurement will be reserved for placement with small business. On March 27, 1952, the Defense Department issued a directive providing the necessary administrative framework, with details to be provided by each of the services. The Air Force has issued a directive covering actual operation for that service, and representatives of SDPA have been assigned to the headquarters of the Air Materiel Command at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, where the great bulk of Air Force procurement is handled. Similar directives have not yet been issued by the Army and Navy, but the Army has authorized assignment of SDPA representatives to certain of its purchasing offices as a preliminary step.

Under sections 714 (e) (6) and 714 (f) (1), SDPA is authorized to certify small business concerns as competent, with respect to capacity and credit, to perform specific Government contracts. The certificate is conclusive upon Government procurement officers, and affords a method of aiding small business to meet requirements as to qualification. At the time of the hearings, 14 certificates of competence had been issued, and 12 concerns so certified had received contracts totaling more than \$10,500,000.

Under its authority to recommend small-business loans to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, SDPA has acted on 185 applications, making favorable recommendations on over 100, totaling approximately \$14,500,000, and to date 55, totaling \$6,000,000 have been approved by RFC. Several hundred other applications are under consideration by SDPA.

The Administration is also entering upon the task of eliminating any procurement practices which have effects disadvantageous to small business. Arrangements have been made with the Army to eliminate bid and performance bonds on supply contracts where the interests of the Government can otherwise be protected, relieving small concerns of the difficulty they find in obtaining such bonds. Changes in the renegotiation regulations have been obtained to encourage subcontracting to small firms. Greater availability to small business of V-loan guaranties by the authorized agencies is being sought. SDPA has also recommended to the Department of Defense that it liberalize its standards for granting adjustments in Government contract prices under title II of the First War Powers Act, so as to enable small business to qualify more readily for such adjustments where unforeseen developments justify it. By cooperation between SDPA and NPA the latter has established a special reserve of steel, copper, and aluminum to take care of small-business hard-

ship cases, and by April 15, 1952, nearly 400 small firms had obtained materials relief from this reserve.

In the field of tax amortization, SDPA and DPA are engaged in a program to insure that small manufacturers will receive their fair share of tax amortization assistance in expansion programs.

Under this set-aside program, a definite small-business share of each industrial expansion goal will be established, based on the pre-Korean position of small business in the industry, or segment of industry being expanded. Where added capacity is being sought the Defense Production Administration will hold open the small-business share for 30 days, while SDPA notifies small concerns of this opportunity to take part in the program if they can otherwise qualify for accelerated tax write-offs. Where goals have already been established, and it appears that a disproportionate share of certificates has been going to larger firms, SDPA and DPA will urge small-business participation with a view to restoring the pre-Korean balance between larger and small firms. These small manufacturers have received only 10 percent of the value of tax amortization certificates, although the same firms in fiscal 1951 received 20.9 percent of military prime contracts.

The Government is now the largest single purchaser in our economy, and Government procurement will play a major and increasing role in our economy for a considerable time to come. The factors, in a large mobilization program, which tend to pinch out the small manufacturer, have not been eliminated. Cut-backs in the allocation of critical materials for civilian use, which present especial difficulty for the small concerns, will continue for an indefinite period. Extra difficulty in obtaining financing for defense and essential civilian production will always be one of the problems of small business. The necessity for a Government program, on a stable and effective footing, to assist small business to obtain its fair share of defense work is even more acute than it was when the original authority was granted. Your committee recommends, therefore, that the Small Defense Plants Administration be continued until June 30, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
UNITED STATES SENATE.
DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF
1952 (S. REPT. 1599 ON S. 2594)
EXTENSION OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS
ADMINISTRATION

Your committee recommends an extension until June 30, 1953, of the Small Defense Plants Administration (sec. 714). Its purpose was to assist and enable small businesses to obtain a fair share of defense contracts and also their proper share of allocated materials in order that they might contribute to defense production and essential civilian production. In adopting this amendment to the Defense Production Act, Congress reaffirmed its belief that the conservation of small business enterprise is a prerequisite if we are to preserve and enhance, if possible, the competitive element in American business enterprise.

The primary aid of SDPA was not only to help the small-business man, but, more important, to get the small-business man to help the defense effort. The aggregate productive capacity of small business is tremendous and all efforts must be made to utilize this potential. This requires special effort and special safeguards to prevent small business from being impaired and engulfed while we operate under a system of allocations and large defense spending.

The Small Defense Plants Administration assists small business in receiving its proportionate share of defense contracts that it can handle; its fair share of materials whenever it is necessary to have them under allo-

cation; and financial assistance it needs to participate effectively in defense and essential civilian business.

A report of the Munitions Board shows that the dollar volume of military prime contracts placed with small concerns has been steadily decreasing. In fiscal 1950 the percentage was 24.5; in fiscal 1951, 20.9; and the first half of fiscal 1952, 19.7. There is no basis for the belief that the trend will reverse itself. The study of the statistics of World War II shows that if strenuous efforts are made small business will share more equitably in defense spending. The small-business share of procurement by the Army service forces rose from 12.6 percent in 1943 to 26.7 percent in June 1945. This rise was largely due to the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The most important and difficult task of the Small Defense Plants Administration is to broaden and increase the participation of small-business concerns in Government procurement. In addition to protecting our economy a great diffusion of military procurement will speed production, spread know-how, and increase strategic dispersal of industry and retain the productive potential of small plants.

SDPA since its inception has engaged in the following major activities in an attempt to maintain and implement the position of small business in our economy.

1. Recommendations to RFC of loans to small concerns for defense and essential civilian purposes.

2. Assistance in obtaining accelerated tax amortizations.

3. Negotiations with the Department of Defense to place SDPA procurement specialists in the major contracting offices of the Armed Forces.

4. Certifications of small plants as competent with respect to credit and capacity to perform contracts in order that contracts may be awarded such plants.

5. Encouraged and assisted in the formation of producing pools.

6. Furnished technical advice and assistance to small plants on when and how to obtain defense contracts.

7. Establish field offices and regional advisory boards as appropriations permitted.

This committee feels that so long as materials are allocated and tremendous sums are being channeled into defense production, the existence and capacity of the small businesses of this country must be safeguarded and protected in order to preserve one of the foundation stones of our competitive economy.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953
(H. R. 8370), JUNE 26, 1952
(H. Rept. No. 2316)

Small Defense Plants Administration: Funds are approved in the amount of \$3,500,000 for the salaries and expenses of this agency. If the efforts of the Government to assist small business are to be successful and at the same time economical a thorough study of the small-business activities of other Federal agencies must be made by the proper authorities to insure that no duplication exists and that the intent of the authorizing act as regards transfer of funds and functions to SDPA are carried out to a greater degree than has been true in the past.

The estimate of \$5,000,000 for a revolving fund to be used by this agency in the purchase of prime contracts is approved in the amount of \$3,000,000.

JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT—REPORT OF THE
JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT
ON THE JANUARY 1952 ECONOMIC REPORT OF
THE PRESIDENT

(S. Rept. No. 1295)

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

President's recommendation: Aid small business by providing the necessary funds

for the Small Defense Plants Administration.

Committee's views: The mobilization program has had a damaging impact on small producers. Because of size and limited financial reserves, small business is especially vulnerable to the imbalances caused by large-scale military buying, rationing of materials, price and wage controls, heavy taxation, and a tight skilled-labor market. Since current small-business problems stem in large measure from disruptions created by the mobilization program, the Government has a responsibility for taking every precaution to minimize the hardships produced for small enterprises. At its last session Congress established the Small Defense Plants Administration to meet this obligation. An appropriation was passed providing funds for initial planning and organization but not for operation. This committee feels that adequate funds should be provided for a purposeful small-business operation and it therefore endorses the President's recommendation.

Further, the committee recommends that small-business organizations from other departments should be transferred to the Small Defense Plants Administration with the exception of small-business activities and organizations necessary to normal operations of the respective departments.

At the same time, the committee maintains that congressional efforts to assist small business cannot be limited to these steps. The Senate and House Committees on Small Business must continue their efforts on behalf of small business. Both committees in their annual reports just issued have made recommendations relating to how small-business men can become more effectively integrated in the defense program.

An excellent example of SDPA's effort to serve is incorporated in a small booklet entitled "Small Defense Plants Administration: What It Is, What It Does." This booklet with appropriate illustrations has received wide acclaim for telling a big story in the fewest possible words:

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION:
WHAT IT IS, WHAT IT DOES

CREATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF SDPA

The Small Defense Plants Administration was created on July 31, 1951, when, by unanimous action of Congress, section 714, establishing the agency and outlining its functions, was added to the Defense Production Act.

It was the expressed intent of Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution to the defense program; and that small business be maintained as a vital part of the national economy.

SDPA was established as an agency with no primary function or interest other than the preservation and promotion of small-business enterprise. Accordingly, Congress specified that SDPA "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government."

A precedent for SDPA was the Smaller War Plants Corporation of World War II. That agency was able to help small business make an invaluable contribution to the war effort and our ultimate victory.

The principal functions of the Small Defense Plants Administration, as prescribed by Congress, are to see to it that (1) small business gets its fair share of defense contracts, (2) it receives a fair share of critical materials, and (3) it gets the financial and technical assistance needed to participate effectively in defense and essential civilian activities.

Telford Taylor, Administrator of the agency, took the oath of office October 19, 1951. Initial funds for preliminary organization of SDPA were appropriated by Congress November 1.

ORGANIZATION

SDPA's Washington office is organized as follows:

There are six main operating offices: Contract Procurement, Prime Contract Operations, Materials, Loans, Production and Management Assistance, and Field Operations. They report directly to one of two Deputy Administrators.

Grouped under the other Deputy Administrator are the Office of Programs and Economic Analysis and the Office of Information.

These two Deputy Administrators, plus an Assistant Administrator, and the general counsel, report directly to the Administrator.

Reporting to the Assistant Administrator are these offices: Budget and Finance, Personnel, Organization and Management, and Administrative Services.

FIELD OPERATIONS

Although SDPA regional directors are responsible to the Administrator, the Washington Office of Field Operations directs, plans and coordinates the field activities.

One of the principal objectives of the agency is to maintain a field service capable of providing one-stop service at the local level in solving small business problems arising from the mobilization program.

The agency has regional offices in principal industrial areas of the country. Each regional director has an advisory board, made up of representative small-business men from the area. These boards consult with and advise the regional offices on small-business problems, and make recommendations to the agency. Each advisory board has an industry vice chairman who serves as a member of the National Small Business Advisory Board under the chairmanship of the SDPA Administrator.

(A list of the regional offices is contained at the back of this pamphlet.)

AGENCY PROGRAM AND OBJECTIVES

Within the limitations of the available funds and a small staff, SDPA has made substantial progress in establishing a program and putting it into effect. Its program and objectives are described in brief outline below.

Financial assistance

One of the most pressing problems of small-business concerns in any mobilization or emergency period is that of obtaining the necessary financial assistance for full participation in the defense effort.

SDPA does not make loans, but is authorized to recommend to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation small-business loans for defense and essential civilian production. Such loans may not be granted if private financing is available, or if loans can be granted by the Government under provisions other than section 714 of the Defense Production Act.

Section 714, small-business loans are granted from a fund—not to exceed \$100,000,000 in outstanding loans at any given time—authorized by Congress.

Joint procedures have been developed by SDPA and RFC for handling applications for these loans. Applicants file the usual RFC loan application, plus SDPA Form 22 (Application for Loan Recommendation), with regional RFC offices. RFC sends the Form 22 to SDPA immediately. It analyzes and investigates the loan application, and sends a copy of its report to SDPA for examination and recommended action.

Loan applications began to come into SDPA at the beginning of 1952, and the volume increased steadily. Requests for assistance have come from every area of the country and loans are being granted at an increasing pace.

Small-business firms from all parts of the country have complained to Congress they are not able to get defense contracts without adequate financial backing, and on the other

hand, are not able to get financial backing without defense contracts. The SDPA loan program helps to eliminate this vicious circle.

Materials allocations

SDPA is not authorized to make allotments of materials, but is empowered to "consult and cooperate with appropriate agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting or expanding production by or in the formulation of policy in granting priorities to business concerns." These agencies are required by statute, before issuing such orders or announcing such priority policies, to consult with SDPA.

Since November 1951 SDPA has been represented on the Defense Production Administration Requirements and Program Adjustment Committees, and on the important committees of the National Production Authority. SDPA has worked closely with these allocating agencies to insure recognition of the special problems of small business in connection with materials distribution.

SDPA worked jointly with NPA in establishing a special Small Business Hardship Account of controlled materials for the purpose of supplementing materials allotments to small concerns cut below a break-even point of operation. SDPA is a member of the panel which determines the special allotments for individual small firms.

In addition, SDPA has been able to help in providing spot materials assistance to many small firms unable to obtain relief elsewhere.

Contract procurement

One of the principal reasons for the creation and establishment of SDPA was the desire of Congress to increase the participation of small-business firms in Government procurement. It was felt that, in addition to protecting our competitive economy, greater diffusion of procurement to small concerns was necessary to speed production, spread know-how, increase strategic dispersal of industry, make use of existing facilities, and retain the productive potential of small plants.

Section 714 authorizes SDPA and the procurement agencies to make joint determinations that, in the interest of national defense or the mobilization of productive capacity, specific contracts or parts of contracts shall go to small-business concerns.

SDPA is placing procurement specialists in major contracting offices to help carry out this mandate of Congress by working jointly with procurement officers to earmark and award more contracts to small concerns that are capable of handling them.

SDPA has also issued operating guides to its field offices indicating steps to be followed in increasing subcontracting opportunities for small business. In addition, a comprehensive facilities inventory plan is being put into effect in order to assure maximum utilization of the productive facilities of small business in the defense effort. This program will function at the SDPA regional level through close cooperation with State Governments, procurement officers, and large prime contractors.

SDPA has also taken steps to allow maximum flexibility in awarding contracts to small concerns.

Certificates of credit and capacity

SDPA is authorized to certify small concerns or production pools as competent with respect to credit and capacity to perform a specific contract; and procurement officers are directed by law to accept such certification as conclusive.

This is another measure by which Congress sought to assist and expedite the flow of Government contracts going to small firms.

Small-business production pools

SDPA gives advice and assistance in the formation of small business production

pools, formally authorizes them, and helps them in obtaining defense contracts.

The practicability of such pools was demonstrated during World War II, when 250 of them were authorized and completed \$600,000,000 worth of war contracts.

Other activities

In keeping with its over-all objective of protecting and promoting the welfare of small business wherever possible, SDPA has been active in several other areas. For example, in order to assure small business a fair share of tax amortization benefits from the Government, SDPA recommended to the Defense Production Administration that a set-aside of these benefits be reserved for small concerns, and that expeditious treatment be given all applications for tax amortization from small firms.

Upon recommendation by SDPA, the Renegotiation Board recently revised its regulations to provide specific financial incentives for subcontracting defense work to small-business concerns. This provides additional subcontracting opportunities for small firms.

Another example: SDPA acted early in its existence to discourage the "general right of set-off," a practice whereby a prime contractor could deduct from payments due a subcontractor any sums which the subcontractor might owe the prime in connection with other transactions. Since this operated against small concerns and also harmed defense production, SDPA called it to the attention of Government procurement agencies. Letters were sent out to prime contractors asking them to abandon this practice, and the great majority of them have done so.

Location of regional offices

Region I, Boston: Covering Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut; Edward J. Stewart, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, 40 Broad Street, Boston, Mass. Phone: Hubbard 26200, extension 96.

Region II, New York: Covering New York and New Jersey; Casper H. Citron, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, 2 West Forty-third Street, ninth floor, New York, N. Y. Phone: Chickering 4-6157.

Region III, Philadelphia: Covering Pennsylvania and Delaware.

Region IV, Richmond: Covering Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, District of Columbia, and North Carolina; Leon E. Savage, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, 400 East Main Street, lower level, Richmond, Va. Phone: 3-7421, extension 21.

Region V, Atlanta: Covering Tennessee, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Florida; Hugh Mitchell, acting regional director, 147 Hunter Street, Kline Building, seventh floor, Atlanta, Ga. Phone: Alpine 4682, extension 8660.

Region VI, Cleveland: Covering Ohio, Kentucky, and Michigan.

Region VII, Chicago: Covering Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin; Yngvar Brynildssen, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, room 901, 188 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. Phone: Dearborn 2-4500, extension 571.

Region VIII, Minneapolis: Covering Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana; J. Walter Malmquist, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, 1247 Northwestern National Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. Phone: Main 3244.

Region IX, Kansas City: Covering Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, and Kansas; Roy W. Webb, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, Federal Office Building, room 405, 911 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo. Phone: Baltimore 7000, extension 591.

¹ Regional director yet to be appointed.

Region X, Dallas: Covering Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana; Henry H. Ritter, acting regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, room 808, 1114 Commerce Street, Dallas, Tex. Phone: Riverside 6951, extension 2248.

Region XI,¹ Denver: Covering Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico.

Region XII, San Francisco: Covering California, Arizona, and Nevada; Joseph V. Ragusa, acting regional representative, Small Defense Plants Administration, Flood Building, room 1043, 870 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. Phone: Yukon 2-5800, extension 150.

Region XIII, Seattle: Covering Washington, Idaho, and Oregon; Allan L. Willard, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, Burke Building, room 328, 905 Second Avenue, Seattle, Wash. Phone: Elliot 9030, extension 315.

At this point for the further information of the Members of the House, I desire to cite a few examples of the effectiveness of the Small Defense Plants Administration. There is no doubt that with adequate funds and an opportunity to subdivide contracts through its revolving fund, SDPA's record of accomplishment will materially increase:

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

LOANS

JUNE 1952.

SDPA's financial assistance program, which got under way late in December, is designed to fill a gap in Government credit facilities available for small business.

It has already resulted in \$11,095,540 worth of loans to small plants for defense or essential civilian production, and new loans are being made almost every day.

These loans, which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation makes out of a \$100,000,000 fund on SDPA's recommendation, have gone to 88 small concerns in over half of the States. Some 400 additional applications totaling over \$200,000,000 are pending.

The guiding principle followed in recommending these loans is that encouragement and assistance to small business is, of itself, in the public interest. There is no other loan program which follows this point of view. Other Government lending authorities provide assistance to small business only incidentally to the accomplishment of other objectives.

SDPA's Office of Loans is constantly advising and consulting with small business concerns in the adjustment and management of their financial affairs. It seeks first, to obviate the necessity of Government financing whenever possible, and second, when necessary and merited, to help prepare their loan requests in such a manner that the needed financing will be forthcoming under section 714 of the Defense Production Act.

The SDPA loan program furnishes an effective means of providing the necessary financing to help small firms break the vicious circle that so often thwarts them when they try to get a defense procurement contract—they can't get the contract until they have the loan, and they can't get the loan until they have the contract.

With SDPA help, an increasing number of small firms are getting the kind of assistance they need, and which is not available elsewhere. Many of them are getting this help in the field. SDPA field offices, which began operations in February, have given advice and assistance on financial matters to more than 1,300 small-business men.

¹ Regional director yet to be appointed.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS

SDPA has issued 20 certificates of competency to small firms and these firms have received or are negotiating contracts totaling nearly \$17,000,000.

These certificates, which must be taken as conclusive by contracting officers, establish a firm's competency, with respect to capacity and credit, to perform specific Government contracts. They are not awarded wholesale; they are given only after rigorous SDPA inspection, and only if a plant is the low bidder (or within negotiation range) and the contracting officer has raised a question about a plant's technical or financial ability to perform.

SDPA has put into operation the joint determination procedure (sec. 714 (f) (2) of the Defense Production Act) under which small plants are to be awarded a fair share of prime contracts. Discussions initiated by SDPA resulted in the issuance by the Munitions Board in March of a policy directive providing for the placement of SDPA representatives in contracting offices of the three military departments.

Detailed operating procedures were worked out with the Air Force in April. SDPA representatives have been assigned to Headquarters, Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, and already several contracts have been earmarked for award to small business only. SDPA is still trying to get formal agreements on operating procedures from the Army and Navy, although its representatives have already gone to work in offices of the Quartermaster and Signal Corps and several joint determinations have been made.

Representatives of several thousand small plants have either made personal visits to the SDPA's Office of Contract Procurement or have written letters. A large number of these visits and letters have been to ask spot assistance on current procurement.

SDPA has not had sufficient personnel to follow up each one of these inquiries to determine what results have been achieved in each individual case. However, in some cases SDPA has learned that firms have been successful in obtaining Government contracts, and it is reasonable to suppose that many others have been successful also, but have not informed us of it. It is the usual practice of a small plant to call on SDPA when its needs assistance, but only rarely do they inform SDPA of their successes.

SDPA's procurement operation is only beginning, but the results of the operation at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base indicate that the SDPA joint determination program will result in far greater percentage of prime contracts going to small business than in the past.

In 4 weeks of operation at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, SDPA has screened 237 procurements and made joint determinations on 27 of these in the amount of \$21,890,135. The operation at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base was started at the end of the fiscal year when the procurement flow is very small.

SDPA is recruiting qualified personnel to establish approximately 65 operations similar to that at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in all of the principal contracting centers of the armed services and major civilian agencies.

It is the objective of SDPA to reverse the declining trend of contracts being awarded to small business. The agency believes that small business participation in defense procurement can and should be increased to at least 35 percent of all procurement, whereas, for the current fiscal year through March, small business' share has been only 18.4 percent.

SDPA field offices have also been active in giving assistance. They have given help in more than 2,000 cases involving defense contracts.

FLEXIBILITY IN PROCUREMENT

Flexibility in procurement procedures, a condition long urged by many Members of Congress, has now been made possible through the efforts of SDPA. It only remains for the Defense Department to translate its authority into specific directives.

In reply to specific questions by SDPA, the Comptroller General has ruled that: (1) wherever procurement through negotiation was authorized by law, price differentials may be paid to small concerns in appropriate cases, even though the mechanics of formal advertising had been used; and (2) even where negotiation was not authorized and formal advertising was required by law, the payment of a price differential would be authorized if a joint determination had been made under section 714 (f) (2).

These two rulings give the military all the authority needed to carry out its own policy statement of April 5, 1951, favoring the payment of price differentials "to broaden the industrial base of procurement." Moreover, they remove whatever barriers may have existed to a reversion to World War II policy of paying price differentials to small concerns.

As the war experience proved, these differentials (which are more nominal than real) are useful in preserving existing enterprises and speeding up military production.

PRODUCTION POOLS

SDPA has moved to bring about a more efficient system of approving small-business production pools. Only 14 of these pools have been OK'd in the current mobilization program as contrasted with 250 during World War II.

SDPA felt that the diffusion of responsibility among five Federal agencies of the authority to approve these pools had a great deal to do with the small number approved. Therefore, it asked and obtained the Defense Production Administration's concurrence in a plan to centralize the approval power in SDPA. Consummation of this plan rests on the issuance of an Executive order which is now under study by the Bureau of the Budget.

In the meantime, SDPA has been assisting in the formation of production pools, a function transferred to the agency from NPA last February. Before SDPA came into existence only five pools had been organized and approved. Now there are 14. Six of these pools have been successful in obtaining more than \$2,000,000 in defense prime and subcontracts.

CONTROLLED MATERIALS

Close to 500 small-business firms have been saved from disaster through assistance from a special "hardship" reserve of materials established by the National Production Authority in cooperation with SDPA.

This special reserve of steel, copper, and aluminum was created, in line with a proposal by SDPA, for the sole purpose of taking care of small business hardship cases. The Director of SDPA's Office of Materials is a member of the panel which reviews all requests for supplemental allotments from this reserve for small businesses unable to maintain minimum operations with regular allotments.

Representatives of SDPA sit in as members on the top committees that decide how the controlled materials—steel, copper products, and aluminum—are to be divided among the various claimants, and on the committee that recommends the issuance of new materials allocation orders or the revocation of orders.

SDPA representatives are thus in a position to look out for the welfare of the small-business man by helping shape the basic decisions that are made with regard to the distribution and use of controlled materials.

SUBCONTRACTING

SDPA has acted to increase subcontracting to small concerns by obtaining changes in

the regulations of the Renegotiation Board.

SDPA successfully urged on the Renegotiation Board, both by letter and in discussions, certain changes in the regulations to make clear that prime contractors would be given favorable consideration where they subcontracted substantial amounts to small-business concerns. There had been widespread doubt about this point until the Board altered its regulations in accordance with SDPA suggestions.

Also to increase subcontracting to small concerns, SDPA has a subcontracting program, administered in the field, which acts as a catalyst in bringing together large prime contractors and small-plant subcontractors.

Each SDPA regional office is supplied with the names of large primes in its area who may be expected to have substantial work to subcontract. Small plants are directed to subcontracting opportunities thus identified.

SDPA maintains contact at the top management level of large manufacturers, and has successfully urged several large primes to appoint "small business specialists" to make subcontracting easier. SDPA also maintains lists of small business productive facilities and brings them to the attention of large prime contractors with work to be farmed out.

FACILITIES INVENTORY

To carry out the provision of section 714 (e) (1) of the Defense Production Act, SDPA is putting into operation a plan for an industrial facilities inventory on a national basis, making full use of inventories made or to be made by State governments.

Great emphasis is placed on local responsibility, comprehensiveness, simplicity, and constant renewal of data. The program has practical value for procurement agencies, State governments, and prime contractors. Its aim is to provide at all times and up-to-date, simple listing of productive facilities across the Nation. Its possibilities for both emergency and peacetime use are obvious.

TAX AMORTIZATION

Upon SDPA's recommendation, a program has been established to assure small-business firms equitable participation in the Nation's industrial-expansion program now being encouraged by accelerated tax write-offs.

SDPA research disclosed that only 10 percent of the certificates had gone to small business, despite the fact that small business accounts for 42 percent of the total employment in manufacturing. It proposed to DPA, and DPA accepted, a plan under which SDPA studies various expansion goals and recommends percentages of them to be filled by small-business firms. Time is given for SDPA to find sufficient small-business firms to fill the quota we recommend.

SDPA's aim is to try to maintain the pre-Korea, small business-big business ratio within industries. This ratio was considerably upset in the first year of the present emergency.

CONTRACT PRICE ADJUSTMENTS

At SDPA's urging, the military is reexamining its administration of contract price adjustments, provided for by law to relieve hardships on a firm caught between rising costs and an inflexible price term in the contract.

SDPA feels that the armed services have been much too rigid in granting relief under this statute. Up to February 14, 1952, the Navy Contract Adjustment Board had denied 47 out of 49 applications for relief; the Army Board had denied 17 out of 36, and the Air Force had turned down every application received.

SDPA urged a redrafting of current regulations in a letter to the Secretary of Defense and has followed up this initial request in a number of conferences and personal contacts.

BID AND PERFORMANCE BONDS

At SDPA's request, the Army Corps of Engineers agreed to modify a practice which operated to prevent small plants from competing for contracts which they were qualified to undertake:

The Corps of Engineers had been requiring bid and performance bonds from bidders on advertised supply contracts of \$100,000 or more, whether or not there was any need for them.

SDPA pointed out that most other military branches had no such policy, and successfully urged the Corps of Engineers to change its policy so that bonds would be required only in individual cases where there are special reasons for doing so.

DISTRESSED AREAS

SDPA asked and obtained from the Acting Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization a ruling to clarify and strengthen the Government policy that a fair proportion of defense contracts shall be awarded to small business.

Under ODM Directive No. 4 (relief of distressed areas) some contracts susceptible of performance by small business were being awarded to big concerns in distressed areas. Dr. Steelman's ruling made it clear that this was contrary to Government procurement objectives.

WAGE CONTROLS

The Wage Stabilization Board is expected to revive the World War II exemption from wage controls of concerns with eight or fewer employees.

This was recommended by SDPA to the head of the Economic Stabilization Administration on the ground that such controls frequently work disproportionate hardship on small concerns who find that, because of their unfamiliarity with Government procedures and the consequent delays in obtaining adjustments in their wage scales, they lose key personnel to larger concerns which have been able to obtain adjustments more quickly.

V-LOANS

Also on SDPA's request, the Department of Defense is considering modification of its V-loan regulations, which SDPA feels are too restrictive on small business concerns.

The V-loan program was created for the very purpose of making possible maximum participation by small business concerns in defense production. But Defense Department administration of the program falls far short of accomplishing this objective.

Meanwhile, the V-loan regulations of other guaranteeing agencies have been surveyed, and, where it was felt that they too failed to carry out the intention of Congress, requests for revisions were made. Thus far, one such agency, the Department of Commerce, has agreed to revise its regulations accordingly.

MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT

SDPA has established a machinery and equipment assistance program which already has obtained needed tools for several small concerns in various parts of the country.

Through SDPA's efforts, some 50 large producers of machine tools have been persuaded to subcontract work on which they are currently behind schedule.

SDPA has likewise acted to promote the availability of machinery, machine tools, and production equipment to the smaller manufacturer by:

(a) Obtaining a 7-day freeze on used or imported machine tool stocks in behalf of small concerns;

(b) Establishing a catalog file of over 400 domestic and foreign machine tool producers and distributors to assist small concerns in locating needed machines:

(c) Sending a special mission to the Detroit area to assist in improving employment—more than \$4,000,000 worth of subcontracts were placed with small machinery manufacturers to relieve the work-load on several large manufacturers.

(d) Working with NPA, FSA, and the military departments in developing a central inventory of machine tools. By the dissemination of this list through regional offices, small concerns may immediately be in position to acquire needed tools.

SPOT ASSISTANCE

Through its 13 field offices already in operation, and through the central office in Washington, SDPA has rendered spot assistance to many individual small firms in virtually every State of the Union and engaged in almost every type of small business.

Assistance given ranges from help in obtaining contracts to advice or financial aids, from getting increased allotments, of controlled materials to solving complex engineering problems.

Many letters of thanks to SDPA attest the value of the spot assistance program.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS CONCERNING SDPA ASSISTANCE

A Houston, Tex., air-conditioning company: "When I was finally directed to your organization, our company had all but ceased operations for the want of 60 tons of steel and 3,000 pounds of copper. In a matter of hours your people had given us what amounted to survival and we are grateful indeed."

A Peoria, Ill., small business production pool: "We are most happy to say that we have positive proof that SDPA will be the salvation of small business in this defense emergency and economy, and that all small business will profit through this administration and it is our belief small business is fortunate to have such able men working on its behalf, and that this new agency will not be a 'lip-service' department for they have proved they will produce."

* * * We have not received, through the aid of SDPA, one small contract with the Air Force at Wright-Patterson Air Base in Dayton, two contracts from the Ordnance Department of the Rock Island Arsenal, of which one is very substantial, one from the Navy Purchasing Office in Washington; and are in the final negotiation stage of a \$3,000,000 contract with another branch of the services which we flatly state without the efforts of SDPA we would never have been considered for this item."

A Rochester, N. Y., manufacturer of oil drum faucets and hard goods: "My first awakening that your organization was operating entirely different than the rank and file of Government agencies was during our correspondence last March. You offered us assistance and went out of your way, even beyond furnishing the information we asked for, to give us leads on opportunities for bidding on Government contracts."

A Clifton, N. J., electronics firm: "We are well aware that the issuance of this certificate of competency by the SDPA was the deciding factor in the award of this contract * * * and will do our utmost to justify the confidence expressed in us by your administration."

A District of Columbia electronics firm: "Please permit me to express appreciation for the splendid assistance which you and your agency have given us in our efforts to obtain an equitable share of Government work through subcontracting. * * * If it had not been for the persistence of you and your agency, our situation would have by this time reached the hopeless stage. * * * Feel there is now an agency available which is interested in protecting small business and in preserving its usefulness to the national economy. * * * We hope that you will

continue to remain alert to the needs of small business."

A Reading, Pa., clothing manufacturer: "We wish to thank the Small Defense Plants Administration for its decisive part in helping our small firm obtain the order for field jacket liners being purchased by the Marine Corps at Philadelphia. * * * We cannot tell you how much this means to us, and sufficiently express our thanks. The entire item which we have now obtained through your intervention is something over \$75,000. This is not much for a very large concern, but it is substantial for us. If we had not received this order, we would have had to drop a large number of our employees, perhaps never to get them back again, and perhaps within a short period have had to terminate operations completely. We are now assured of at least substantial partial operation for several months, which is not bad for a firm in a distress area. Small Defense Plants Administration deserves a note of thanks for what it has done."

A New York wire, rope, and chain maker: "It has been a source of comfort to us and we are sure to others similarly placed, to know that there is at least one arm of the Government that reflects the viewpoint of small business and concentrates its efforts to preserve the interests of small business in our national plan of economy and prevent its destruction or usefulness through lack of proper consideration. * * * We feel very strongly that such an agency is an important and necessary part of our Government."

A New England (Millbury, Mass.) wire company: "I take this opportunity to write and thank you for your valuable efforts in bringing about a quick approval of our certificate of necessity."

An Illinois metal fabricator: "May I congratulate you on evolving an agency that is positively helping small business."

A Pennsylvania tire and rubber company: "We are deeply grateful to your Administration for your assistance in this matter and it is gratifying to know that there is at least one agency in Washington which will not only talk about helping small businesses but will actually do something about it."

A New England State development commission: "Again I wish to commend the effective way in which the Small Defense Plants Administration is following up these various complaints as they are brought to your attention. It is this type of personal interest that can go a long way toward establishing confidence among our small concerns in the work of your agency."

A Massachusetts research firm: "Please accept the thanks of this corporation for your services in our behalf. * * * It is comforting to know. * * * SDPA is anxious to help us."

A Massachusetts aluminum fabricator: "I have received a notice from the NPA that my allocation of aluminum foil has been reinstated. It is needless to say that this is of great importance to me, as without it, I would have been forced out of business. Your efforts in regaining this allocation for me are greatly appreciated. * * * In closing let me say humbly, thank you for a job well done."

A Kingsport, Tenn., manufacturer: "The kindness and help you gave me * * * is certainly appreciated. It would have been impossible for me to have accomplished anything without your cooperation."

A Cleveland, Ohio, manufacturer (materials assistance case): "Our supplemental application has received favorable action. * * * Your help and advice was invaluable."

A Great Falls, Mont., wholesale firm (materials assistance case): "Our very deep appreciation for the consideration your office has shown in following through our diffi-

culties with the various offices which might possibly help us. * * * Many thanks for the wonderful cooperation."

The Chamber of Commerce of Hugo, Okla.: "We were especially impressed with the work that you are doing for small industries and small communities * * * believe that you and your office are the answer to our problem."

A Lake View, N. Y., distributor of home building equipment: "Our deepest appreciation for the efforts you exerted in behalf of small business generally, and this company particularly, relative to the * * * invitation to bid."

A Pawtucket, R. I. textile manufacturer: "We * * * received the contract * * * and I want to thank you again for helping to expedite this matter."

The operator of a small radio station in Odessa, Tex.: "With your help and advice, I finally got the necessary permits. Thank you * * * for your thoughtful assistance."

A Port Chester, N. Y., law firm: "Recently on behalf of one of our clients * * * I had the occasion to request aid and assistance from your organization * * * [it] understood the client's problem and * * * with dispatch was of assistance."

The Naugatuck Valley Industrial Council, Inc., Waterbury, Conn.: "Although your agency is still in its infancy, [it] has already rendered notable assistance to two of our very small concerns in getting materials for them."

Of great interest to small business is the provision of the Small Defense Plants amendment—section 714 (e), (1), Public Law 96, Eighty-second Congress—requiring an inventory of small-business facilities which may be utilized for defense production. This subsection was included after a conference with the representatives of our State Planning and Development Agencies. In fact, the members of the legislative subcommittee of the Association of State Planning and Development Officials sat with the Members of the House Small Business Committee when this particular provision was written. It is the first coordinated effort to perform a task which in the past has failed of accomplishment because the authority was lacking for effective cooperation between State and Federal officials.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION APPROACH TO NATION-WIDE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES INVENTORY PLAN

Pursuant to and in conformity with those specific portions of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, viz: section 714 (d) (1) "utilization of productive capacity of small business," and section 714 (e) "inventory of productive facilities of small business," together with other related portions of the entire act, a proposed plan was completed on February 8, 1952, establishing a procedure for developing a Nation-wide industrial facilities inventory.

On February 12 and 13 this proposed plan was submitted to the Executive Committees on Small Business which had been previously established and received their unanimous approval. These committees were composed of representatives of every agency of the Federal Government concerned with Federal procurement.

On February 18 the Munitions Board of the Defense Department appointed a

representative from each of the Departments of Defense and in turn such civilian agencies as the General Services Administration, Mutual Security Agency, Atomic Energy Commission, and others did likewise, all of whom were to serve as a working committee in further implementing and developing the proposed plan.

PURPOSE

The proposed plan has as its basic purpose an inventory of the Nation's industrial facilities designed to contain the elements of uniformity, simplicity, usefulness, and perpetuity.

Analysis of previous plans which have first been tried and failed indicate two fundamental weaknesses: First, duplication of basic information; and second, collectively they represent only a portion of the available industrial potentiality existent in the Nation. While it is quite true that procurement officers usually have considerable facilities information on the larger manufacturing concerns, they are still required to seek out sources of supply when confronted with the constant changes effected by research and development and are still uninformed on the industrial potentiality of that segment of production capacities present in the smaller industries throughout the Nation. In innumerable instances Federal procurement agencies depend upon prime contractors and the larger manufacturing concerns to seek out this unknown segment. We find, however, that such prime contractors are likewise unaware of a vast portion of the industrial potentialities available in the smaller manufacturing plants. This entire condition, therefore, tends toward the larger industrial sections of the country building up unnecessary backlogs of defense and civilian production.

The purpose, therefore, of the proposed plan is to bring effectively and efficiently into focus, and to the attention of procurement agencies that unknown segment of the industrial potentiality and open capacities which exist throughout the Nation.

OBJECTIVES

The principal objective of the proposed plan is to make available to Federal and State procurement agencies alike as well as prime contractors and the larger manufacturing concerns accurate, factual, and current facilities information which will enable procurement to spread the base of prime contracting through increased subcontracting, accelerate defense production by such means through reduction of backlogs, and to aid small business in the utilization of existing open capacities and its usable facilities now unknown. A further objective of the plan is to provide the Federal Government with a constantly up-to-date uniform listing of the entire Nation's industrial facilities in the event of war, assure maximum utilization of existing productive capacities in war or peace and through operation of the plan assist and facilitate the procurement officers in the performance of their duties and functions which, under present complexities, are already difficult enough.

The plan would serve innumerable other objectives in that the working

loads of procurement officers, agencies, and centers would be materially reduced, vital and necessary statistical data would be made available to such agencies as military and civil defense in the event of emergencies and very definite aid would be rendered in preserving free enterprise. Such a plan in full operation is vitally essential to this Nation's economy.

FUNCTIONS AND PROCEDURES

To accomplish the foregoing objectives the plan encompasses the following functions:

Examination of industrial facilities information required by all Federal procurement levels indicates that a uniform code record can be developed on every specific manufacturing plant which will meet the requirements of and furnish information common to all procurement officers. The code record system is now being developed by the working committee previously mentioned.

Each State government has within its own operations mechanical means of reproducing such code information either in the form of IBM equipment, Remington Rand equipment, MacBee card records, et cetera. Each State government will be requested simultaneously to acquire the code information necessary on every manufacturing concern within its State. Such information would be uniform throughout all States. Every industry within each State upon the completion of its inventory facilities record will submit such record to its own State government where the code card will be made. Every time a manufacturing concern makes any changes in its man-hour production capacities through changes in equipment or skills, it will notify its own State government of such change so that the code card record can be brought up to date. Once each month each manufacturing plant will report its contemplated open capacities for the succeeding months which information will likewise be recorded on the code card.

Such additional information as may be found necessary once the Nationwide plan is in operation can be reported periodically by the manufacturing concern to its own State government. This information might have to do with changes made by the individual concerns in their staff of engineering talent, craftsmanship, skills, et cetera.

Each SDPA regional office will have on its staff an industrial engineer who will be liaison between State governments and the procurement agencies within its region. Such procurement agencies will notify SDPA regional offices of its contemplated procurement with sufficient lead time to enable the SDPA regional office to obtain listings of those plants or manufacturing concerns who have the facilities with which to produce the items being procured. By utilization of mechanical means such as above mentioned, the State governments could produce within 24 hours lists of the manufacturing concerns within their State who could fulfill the procurement. Such listings will be furnished procurement officers immediately.

In the case of prime contractors seeking sources of subcontracting, they will utilize the same services of the SDPA regional offices who will act as liaison between the prime contractors and the State government's industry facilities records bureau.

In the case of large procurement orders, all regional offices of SDPA can be alerted simultaneously so that listings can be received from all regions, thereby enabling procurement officers to spread their field of procurement inquiry and, if necessary, split such procurement to various sections of the country. This would serve to accelerate procurement.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the facts obtained thus far, it can be very definitely concluded that the plan is workable. Agencies concerned with procurement have expressed the opinion that it will be most useful, that it will avoid duplication of their efforts and will reduce their workloads. It has further been expressed by them that the entire plan is a very definite aid and tool to procurement procedures that it in no sense detracts from nor usurps authorities vested in them, that the information it is proposed to be obtained by this plan is needed, and that with the SDPA regional offices functioning as the medium through which industry facilities information is supplied them, much of their own cumbersome and exhaustive record keeping can be dispensed with.

The necessity for some medium through which an accurate and perpetual knowledge of available industrial facilities, open capacities, and potentialities can be established is a recognized fact and it is the conclusion of all those to whom this plan has been submitted that it will fulfill such necessity.

Representatives of those State governments, approximately 26 thus far, with whom this plan has been discussed have expressed the highest regard for the plan and complete willingness to cooperate. Further, large manufacturing concerns who have in the past handled extensive prime contracts have expressed full concurrence with the plan.

The cost of making the plan effective is negligible, would be nowhere near the cost of the several plans which in the past have been tried and failed and could conceivably develop into a very substantial saving to the Federal Government in its over-all procurement procedure.

THE PROGRAM OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS HAS BEEN OF GREAT ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS FIRMS AND UNITS—A REVIEW OF OUR ACTIVITIES DURING THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, we are presently engaged in the struggle to preserve, protect, and defend our social, political, and economic freedoms. The United States is one of the few countries in the world that actually has preserved the fundamental concept of a representative form of government. Our survival is dependent not only upon our military strength and international negotiation, but we must preserve within our borders, freedom of enterprise and equality of opportunity. In a dynamic

society or economy, such as ours, we must constantly scrutinize and correct any forces which tend to deprive us of our most prized possession—freedom of action. Only through continuous examination can we guarantee the existence of individual initiative, a reward for risk taking in a competitive economy.

Although our present standard of living and productive strength is due to a considerable extent to the mass production system, our vast natural resources, large capital accumulation and the skill of the working people, the backbone and strength of our society still lies with the small business firm and small business units.

In the past 2 decades, we have seen the gradual development of big business, big labor, and big government with more and more concentration of economic power in the few. Of all the economic groups in this country, the small-business man has offered the greatest resistance to this centralization of control. Of all groups, however, the small firm is most susceptible to fluctuations in economic well-being. These firms suffer the most during depressions, profit the least during boom periods and have little opportunity to maintain their place during a war or total defense program. Despite this struggle to remain alive, the small firm still predominates and every year more individuals appear willing to start a business, bringing with them new investment and new ideas. They are anxious to compete and all of them hope eventually to become larger.

Out of approximately 4,000,000 business firms in existence today nearly 90 percent are considered small.

A large percentage of small businesses are single proprietorships or partnerships where one or two men manage all phases of the business. The manager is usually the owner. He keeps the books, acts as salesman. He is the buyer and foreman. He must keep up with economic trends. He must acquire a position in his community. He must do all things which in a larger business are assigned to experts or specialists. If he is industrious and intelligent he will prosper when given a fair chance and an equal opportunity. This is the economic climate we are trying to preserve.

The small-business man, however, cannot be expected to operate efficiently or compete when confronted by unfair methods of competition, monopoly, shortages of materials and labor, curtailment of civilian consumption because of defense mobilization, and other ills which have beset him in the past few years. It was to help the small concern or small units who found themselves in such circumstances that caused the House to establish the Select Committee on Small Business late in 1941.

I should like to review with you what this committee has been doing during the Eighty-second Congress, the investigations that we have conducted, the information we have collected, the recommendations we have made and the benefits we think have accrued to the small business firms from the result of our excellent program.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE

The Select Committee on Small Business, as presently organized, is composed of 11 members, whose chairman is the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, Representative from Texas; and whose ranking member is the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, Representative from the State of Indiana. Congressmen MIKE MANSFIELD, JOE L. EVINS, CLARENCE G. BURTON, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, and CLINTON D. MCKINNON, together with Chairman PATMAN, make up the majority side of the committee. Congressman HALLECK, the minority leader, is supported by Congressmen WILLIAM S. HILL, R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., and THOMAS B. CURTIS. You will note there is one more majority member than minority. There is little or no politics in the work of this committee. We have always cooperated as a unit. Congressman PATMAN with his wide experience in the small business field, as chairman, and Congressman HALLECK, formerly a floor leader on the minority side, have backgrounds which qualify them to steer the work of our committee into fields where it has been of tremendous importance in preserving the small business units of our Nation. Frankly, I am proud of my membership on this most important and worthwhile committee.

THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The principal problems with which the committee has concerned itself and which have exercised great hardship in the past year and a half on the small concern are: First, an inadequate share of defense contracts; second, the lack of materials sufficient to keep the business in operation; third, hardships created by control measures; fourth, cut-throat competition or price discrimination; fifth, financing individual firms; and sixth, the lack of information on the details concerning war contract bids and war contracts.

In every national emergency when our economy has been geared to a defense effort, the problems of small business firms have increased. In recent emergencies there have been restrictions on the amount of civilian goods which may be produced. Credit has been curtailed and savings encouraged so that the consumer would not place additional inflationary funds in the market. In addition there has been a shortage of materials necessary to produce these manufactured goods. The net result is a reduction in both the demand for and the production of goods manufactured by small firms. In order to stay in business, new markets must be developed. During an emergency, the largest buyer is always the Government and it is to this purchaser that the majority of business firms must offer their services or goods. Now, it is true that much of the contracts awarded for the production of war materials such as tanks, airplanes, and ships can only go to the big firms, but there are many parts of the tanks, airplanes, and ships that can be produced by small firms either through the award of prime contracts or through subcontracting. We only ask that the

facilities of small business be used to the greatest extent possible.

The Small Business Committee has made a great effort to see that small business receives a fair share of prime contracts and that big business awards as many subcontracts as possible to them. Every attempt is made to insure the incorporation of small business in the defense effort, not only because it can make a valuable contribution in the form of goods but to help retain a suitable framework upon which free enterprise may continue to operate.

PROCUREMENT DIFFICULTIES OF THE SMALL FIRM

During World War II we saw the effect of indiscriminate awarding of contracts to large firms. It meant increased productive facilities and financial reserves for big business and the closing of the doors of many of our small business firms. From Pearl Harbor to the end of 1943 there was a net loss of business population of one-half million concerns.

Even today we find small business receiving only 19 percent of the total dollar value of all contracts. Sixty percent of these contracts have been awarded to 100 companies for a total of twenty-six and one-third billion dollars. When you think that small business firms represent about 90 percent of all business conducted in this country and then realize that they have been receiving less than 20 percent of the total dollar value of defense contracts, you realize the tremendous and difficult economic problem facing small business units.

FIELD HEARINGS

In an attempt to solve this particular problem, over a period of 5 months, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, conducted a series of field hearings in 29 cities in 23 States where we received testimony from about 700 witnesses. These hearings, held in the businessman's own locality or home town, gave us a chance to directly contact the individual and learn firsthand about his specific problems.

Representatives of Government agencies accompanied us and were benefited by this exposure to the grass roots. Committee members knew all along that small businessmen were relatively inarticulate. These hearings amplified our conclusion. Most small firm operators are lost in the labyrinth of Government regulations, order forms, fine print in the contracts, and so on. Consequently, our contacts at these hearings produced excellent results, both for the representatives of the Government and for the entire Congress at large. Several Congressmen told me that their mail on inquiries concerning Federal contracts diminished almost to the zero point after our committee had held hearings in the localities where defense contracts were being considered.

There are many local problems concerning business operation that are neither understood nor appreciated by the personnel in the Washington offices. As a result, the little fellow feels his country is uninterested in him and not anxious to assist him in solving his difficulties. From these hearings, and from

our own research, we delineated the problems and we searched for the answers. As an operator of a small business firm myself for the last 20 years, I fully appreciate the beneficial effects and the results we had in these most important and essential hearings in the various communities.

We found in particular that there had been insufficient advertised bidding for Government contracts, lack of information on the bids, no definite information as to quantity, time of delivery, and so forth. If contracts were negotiated, there had been insufficient information given to the potential bidders. In many instances information just was not available to the local business firms. It was impossible for them to secure this information from Washington as they had no representation in the Nation's Capital. The typical businessman, according to the information as we collected it, felt that with the gradual disappearance of advertised bidding on Government contracts, procurement officers dealt only with the large firms or those with which they had dealt in the past. Although these concerns would bid on part of a contract, which was their right, procurement officials contrived to award the entire contract to the larger companies. And among other complaints, witnesses stated that their facilities were lying idle or only partially utilized while larger companies built additional facilities to handle Government orders. And I might add that the expense of building the additional facilities was, in many instances, a charge-off of tax benefits. In April 1952 tax write-offs amounted to more than \$17,500,000,000, going to these large firms as a charge-off for the construction of these additional plant facilities. The necessity for many of them could have been reduced by the proper use of small business firms.

It was extremely difficult for the small manufacturer who had not maintained representatives at procurement offices to obtain consideration for a contract.

Although to some extent the procurement base has been broadened and total payments to small business firms increased, the comparative position of the small business firm has been weakened.

CONGRESSIONAL POLICY IN REGARD TO
PROCUREMENT

This committee was astounded to hear so many complaints in the face of declared congressional policy.

The Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 stated specifically that small business should receive a fair proportion of defense contracts.

The Selective Service Act of 1948 stated that small business should be granted a fair share of the orders.

The Defense Production Act states that "it is the sense of the Congress that small business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of this act." The small defense plants amendment to this act recognized the importance of giving small business a fair share of defense contracts and set up an agency to accomplish this objective.

In view of established congressional policy, the obvious necessity of maintaining the small business element in our economy and considering the numerous complaints received by our committee, we made specific recommendations, directed primarily to defense officials, and we requested that they fulfill these objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE PROCUREMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE

We recommend that—

Educational programs be inaugurated to assure that all procurement officials are aware of legislative policy and regulations promulgated to effectuate this policy.

Military small-business specialists be replaced by civilian employees with firm business experience.

Greater use be made of justifiable price differentials in negotiated procurement.

Advertised bidding be used more frequently in purchase of common-use items.

Greater use be made of qualified production pools.

Large firms should not be allowed to increase their productive facilities when there exists available facilities and open space among existing small-business concerns.

And many others designed to facilitate and increase the small businessman's role in Government procurement.

Much still has to be done to assure small business its fair share—the Small Business Committee does feel, however, that its continuing effort has produced beneficial results. We know that because of our studies and recommendations the defense organization is now more aware of the small-business problem. More specific statements of policy and policy implementation have been issued. More civilian specialists are now being used as advisers to the military.

There has been a gradual increase in the use of advertised bids. Negotiated bids are preceded by more adequate information. A distinct effort is now being made to bring prime contractor and potential small subcontractors together.

In addition, defense organizations are being more careful in an attempt to prevent the erection of new and duplicate production facilities.

The biggest problem still remains—how to broaden the procurement base—thereby utilizing more completely the vast productive facilities of this country. The Small Business Committee believes that through its continuing investigations, this may be achieved. Certainly few groups are more acquainted with the problem or in a better position to bring it about.

MATERIAL DIFFICULTIES OF SMALL BUSINESS

During the Eighty-second Congress Subcommittee No. 3 of the Small Business Committee has been studying the difficult problem of material shortages. The lack of raw material has, as much as any other factor, created hardship for the small-business man—without it he can produce for neither Government or civilian consumption.

During an all-out war effort we would expect most of these materials to be diverted to defense production. Under a

partial mobilization program, however, which is expected to continue for many years, all of the defense and much of civilian needs must be considered. This creates the problem of determination of essentiality of use in addition to problems of equitable distribution and acquisition.

Here again the committee concerned itself with the effect of mobilization on the small producer's ability to stay alive and to perform an essential role in the defense program. During the past year and a half—it has conducted several hearings and has brought forth numerous reports containing precise recommendations.

PROBLEMS OF MANUFACTURERS OF FARM MACHINERY

Many specific complaints in regard to material difficulties were raised by businessmen during the field hearings of Subcommittee No. 1. On the basis of this testimony Subcommittee No. 3 was established to make a detailed examination of the materials problems of small business. In May of last year the subcommittee investigated the extreme shortages and gray-market operations affecting small manufacturers of farm machinery. After hearings had been held in Chicago specific recommendations were made to appropriate Government agencies. As a result, gray-market operations were effectively curbed and more regular distribution of steel established.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL USERS OF ALUMINUM

In March 1950 Subcommittee No. 3 held executive hearings to study the particular problems of small users of aluminum. At that time it was proposed to prohibit the use of aluminum in many less substantial items—it would have been a death sentence to those small manufacturers who could not convert to defense production. After some study of the aluminum supply situation, the subcommittee recommended that this action be postponed. This recommendation was accepted and within months the producers of less essential items were placed under the Controlled Materials Plan and allowed to continue production with limited amounts of aluminum. At the same time, suggestions made by this subcommittee were adopted by the National Production Authority to permit more equitable distribution of aluminum scrap to secondary smelters.

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE CONTROLLED MATERIALS PLAN

The most important work done by Subcommittee No. 3 has been its investigations of the problems of small business under the Controlled Materials Plan. Again the need for this particular study had its origin in the field hearings conducted in the spring of 1951, because of the many complaints received by the committee concerning irregularities, discrimination and hardship created by material shortages, and other chaotic conditions which existed in the summer of last year when a weak priorities system was being replaced by a confused partial CMP.

THE PLAN

As you know, the Controlled Materials Plan controls the distribution of all steel, aluminum and copper. On the basis of

essentiality of his production program, each user is given authority to produce a certain amount of material with which to produce the finished product. In theory, no more authorizations to produce will be issued than there is available supply.

Certain programs such as the military, atomic energy, and machine tool programs are given priorities to assure an adequate supply for finished goods and their components. In addition, the use of these materials in the production of certain end products is controlled and inventories are restricted. Not all producers must receive this permission to procure a specific amount of steel, aluminum and copper, however users of small amounts of these metals may self-certify up to specified limits.

FINDINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE IN REGARD TO CMP

The investigation was to determine policy and operational weaknesses in the Controlled-Materials Plan which precluded the orderly production and distribution of steel, aluminum, and copper. Hearings were begun in August and after several weeks of testimony a preliminary report was issued. In this report we attempted to be constructive, pointing out changes which if adopted would improve the allocation of materials under CMP. Our findings and recommendations were these:

Insufficient steel was being allotted to steel expansion programs. In the long run expansion was the only answer to satisfying needs of all steel consumers. We also felt that expansion policy was unrealistic and uncoordinated.

During these hearings we found a definite failure on the part of responsible officials to accurately determine the requirements for and supply of any of these scarce materials. This had the effect of arbitrarily causing the overissue of allotment "tickets" on the one hand, or excess capacity and unfilled order books at the mill on the other. The accurate determination of the need for steel, aluminum, and copper and of the amount of material to be produced by mills was essential to an orderly and precise program of allotment.

The subcommittee was very much disturbed by the inability of many producers to get their orders filled. In fact, the small manufacturer had a difficult time getting sufficient materials to remain in operation. We felt that much of the confusion and frustration during the early days of CMP was due to allowing steel producers to choose their own customers and to the lack of steel going to warehouses. Warehouses ordinarily supply small businesses with the greater part of their needs for these metals. Late in 1951, however, under CMP, warehouses received only 85 percent of their customary supply.

Much of the testimony received during the early days of CMP revealed that a weak compliance program was the cause of many inequalities in metal distribution. Lack of compliance meant many things—excessive inventories, placement of duplicate orders, and the inability of businessmen to interpret highly legal directives issued from Washington.

Our committee also objected in its preliminary report on CMP to the separation of the Defense Production Administration and the National Production Authority, where one was the policy-making body and the other the administrative agency for CMP.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEE IN PRELIMINARY REPORT

In view of these deficiencies and others, which I have just mentioned, we recommended in our preliminary report that the following steps be taken:

First. Sufficient steel be granted expansion programs to permit an adequate future supply of steel.

Second. A more careful review be made of the requirements of users for steel, aluminum, and copper. This meant more careful review of the essentiality of civilian production programs.

Third. Shipments to warehouses be increased.

Fourth. More steel be allocated for schools and hospitals.

Fifth. That the amounts of metal which may be self-certified by small users be increased.

I am happy to say that many of these recommendations were adopted by NPA and DPA. In fact, the administrators of these two agencies have stated that our investigations and recommendations have done much to create a more effective system of allocation.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The problems of small business during an emergency are not confined to procurement and lack of materials. One of its greatest difficulties occurs in the field of finance. Faced with a shutdown because of his inability to immediately convert to defense production and faced with lack of materials because his civilian product is not considered essential, the small-business man finds that additional financing is the only answer to his remaining in operation. For with additional funds, he can convert his plant to more essential production or add new facilities to permit his bidding for defense contracts or subcontracts. In most instances the small-business man has little working capital and insufficient reserves to permit this conversion without additional financial aid. At the same time that the small firm needs financing, banks are requested to restrict their granting of loans. In many instances, bank policy will not permit this type of lending as the bank under such conditions tends to assume the risks of ownership.

SMALL FIRMS COMPARED TO LARGE

We must recognize the fact that the financing of a small business is quite different than the financing of large firms. The latter generally have sufficient reserve to permit expansion or conversion, they are able to borrow from banks with little difficulty, and they can, if necessary, borrow in the securities market.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

One of the more important activities of the Select Small Business Committee is to advise and assist the Members of

the House in enacting legislation dealing with the problems of small business. I should like to reiterate committee policy in this respect. It conducts its investigations and makes its recommendations on a strictly nonpartisan basis. We act to serve the cause of small business, a matter of concern to both political parties.

The legislative work of the committee during the Eighty-second Congress has been confined to two major problems—the role played by small business in the defense effort—and the current competitive situation in our economy.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

In the first instance we have been primarily concerned with the establishment of the Small Defense Plants Administration. As you know, the amendment to the Defense Production Act calling for the establishment of this agency was introduced by the chairman of our committee and the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee. It became law on July 31, 1951. In addition, this committee presented voluminous testimony indicating the need for such an organization.

FUNCTIONS OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

I should like to mention briefly here the activities of SDPA. You will remember that this agency was established to give small business the opportunity to make the greatest possible contribution to the defense effort. In words of the act the function of SDPA is "to coordinate and to ascertain the means by which the productive capacity of small-business concerns can be most effectively utilized for national defense and essential civilian production."

LOANS

In the field of finance, SDPA does not make loans. Rather it is authorized to recommend to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation small-business loans for essential civilian production and for defense. These loans will not be granted if private financing is available. SDPA made its first loan recommendation in December 1951. By January 11, 1952, 3 loans had been recommended to RFC totaling \$507,829, while 15 additional applications totaling over \$5,000,000 were under consideration.

MATERIALS

The Small Defense Plants Administration has no materials to allocate. Its function in this instance is to consult and cooperate with appropriate governmental agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting or expanding production by, or in the formulation of policy in granting priorities to business concerns. To fulfill this purpose SDPA is represented on the principal DPA and NPA committees. It helped establish the Small Business Hardship Account and has rendered spot assistance in obtaining needed materials.

PROCUREMENT

The most important work of the agency is done in the field of procurement. Briefly, SPDA makes joint determinations with procurement agencies as to what contracts or parts of contracts can

be awarded to small business. For this purpose, procurement specialists are being placed in major contracting offices to help designate those contracts which can be performed by small concerns. SDPA is also engaged in making an inventory of all small-business facilities. Finally the agency advises and assists in the creation of production pools and certifies them to procurement officials as to credit and capacity to perform contracts. Unfortunately the facilities of established production pools are not being sufficiently utilized.

Our committee believes that there is a definite need in our defense set-up for an agency in which can be centralized the problems of small business. SDPA is in an excellent position to plead the case of the little fellow and to see that he gets an opportunity and a fair share of contracts, materials, and credit.

FAIR TRADE REPORT

In February of this year this committee issued a report entitled "Fair Trade: The Problems and the Issues." The report discusses the economic aspects of fair trade, the legal issues involved, the relationship of fair trade to our competitive system, the issue of States' rights, and so forth. Both the case for and the case against has been considered. The committee gave serious consideration to the complexity of the fair-trade problem and to the significant arguments both for and against. Its recommendation which accompanied the report was that since small business needs protection against loss-leader and similar unfair business practices, which are also not in the public interest, that the States retain jurisdiction over retail-trade practices. We recommended that Congress should permit the States to make their own choice.

DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS

This committee firmly believes that the problem of small-business units is only part of a larger pattern. It works, therefore, to help the individual small-business man who may submit his request for assistance by letter, telegram, or personal appearance, and it works through reports and investigations to provide better small-business legislation and administration. The committee firmly believes that the role of the small-business man is an indispensable one in an economy for on him depends the future of our political and economic institutions.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks following the paragraph on Small Defense Plants Administration.)

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks following the paragraph on Small Defense Plants Administration.)

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Agriculture to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, \$2,000,000.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT: On page 30, after line 23, insert the following:

"NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

"For an additional amount of \$16,500,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. Code 1751-1760); *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said act."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against the amendment. I make the point of order that the language of the amendment and the paragraph are not germane to this point in the bill. This part of the bill relates entirely to the salaries and expenses of the defense production activities, while the amendment relates to a local, domestic operation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). The Chair is ready to rule. The language of the amendment provides an additional paragraph to the Department of Agriculture section of the bill. It is germane to this section, and the Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, every day that I am in my district office I am approached by the mothers of school children and school officials urging me to have the Federal contribution to the school-lunch program increased. They are quite disturbed because the agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal year 1953 does not provide for an increase in the sum provided for this program. Because at least five additional schools were opened in the Pennsylvania area, the funds for the Philadelphia school district were depleted 2 months prior to the expiration of the school term, and the children had to pay for their own milk. Also, since that time the price of milk has increased 1 cent per quart in Philadelphia. No doubt similar situations exist in many other cities and towns in the United States.

The National School Lunch Act requires that the States match the Federal contribution by one and one-half times. However, in Pennsylvania it is matched four times through the assistance of local school boards, contributions of local organizations, and the amounts put in by the parents. The appropriation for the school-lunch program has remained the same for the past 3 years, and we all know that during that period there have been increases in labor, transportation, and food costs. I understand that the Department of Agriculture in the three previous years requested the Bureau of the Budget to approve a total of \$100,000,000 for the school-lunch program and each time it was decreased to eighty-three and a half million. This additional \$16,500,000 which my amendment requests would bring the appropriation for this program up to the total figure that was originally requested and which the testimony at the hearings on the agriculture appropriation bill substantiated.

On basis of \$100,000,000, Pennsylvania would get approximately \$3,669,000.

In the State of Pennsylvania in the last two school months of the school term, the school authorities were short \$45,000. I think the gentlemen from Pennsylvania will cooperate, because they understand the problem just as I do. In my own district I had mothers and representatives from various schools come to me on one occasion in the number of 75, and then again 150, asking me whether or not the Federal Government could appropriate enough money to sustain these "kiddies" with milk over the balance of the school period.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. The gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, this afternoon said, "Let us have some charity of heart." All I am asking you today is to close your minds a little bit and open your hearts. General Hershey just a few weeks ago made the announcement that 45 percent of the inductees have been rejected for physical reasons. This is an opportunity to build up the health of the youth of the Nation. To allow them \$16,500,000 is trivial in comparison to the money which was allotted here today.

The gentleman from Indiana in his amendment yesterday asked for \$80,000,000 for school construction and also \$11,500,000. Pennsylvania last year had five new schools. Those children in these federally impacted areas had consumed the necessary money allowed to them for the schools in operation up to that time. Certainly they need more money. They need more milk. They need more food. Let us build the youth of our Nation by giving them this \$16,500,000 in this amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN. I want to compliment my colleague from Philadelphia on the excellent presentation he has made of this matter. He knows, as well as all the Members from Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, that this matter has been brought to our attention in the last month by a great number of people. I think the gentleman has done a wonderful job, as always, and I want to compliment him and tell him I am in thorough support of his amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman very much.

I just want to make this observation. I am not offering this amendment for any political reasons. Since I have been a Member of Congress I have gone back and forth to Philadelphia constantly every night after the lights dim on this Capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, I do not like to object, but it is getting late and we

ought not to be giving Members over 5 minutes at this time of day.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman. I thank you very much for your kindness.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and do so as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture through which subcommittee the regular request for our school lunch program is supposed to come. I have always been a strong supporter of this program.

There has been no request, as far as I know—and I leave the substantiation of this to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]—no request for any additional provision for more money for the school lunch program, beyond the \$84,000,000 we gave to it. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if that is not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes; and if the gentleman will yield, I would like to give the House some information I have here.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the chairman of my subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. In 1947 the Congress passed an act which provided for increased State participation. From 1947 to 1950 it was dollar for dollar; for 1951 through 1955 it is to be 1½ to 1; after 1955 it is to be 3 to 1. Notwithstanding the shift as it was set up by the Congress to the States, the Federal contribution has remained the same; we have kept it up. So through additional contributions the total amount should be increased.

Not only is that true, but the amendment which I offered, and which was adopted, permits a savings of section 32 funds for the handling of surpluses which makes many million of dollars more available in commodities than we have had the last 2 or 3 years.

Now, the sky is the limit as to what we would like to do with such a worth while program, but the question is: How much can we do?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Furthermore, the Secretary of Agriculture, at my request and insistence, and also at that of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], put into operation in March and April a program for purchasing certain pork products and shell eggs to the extent of about \$25,000,000; and furthermore at our suggestion, this has been poured into the school lunch program in addition to the \$84,000,000 that we contributed in the regular appropriation bill. By that program we helped our hog and egg prices go up nearer parity for the producer and at the same time helped the school children of America.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment comes out of the clear sky and has not been submitted to either the gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] or myself. Certainly it appears to me to be very much out of place, and I hope it is defeated. I repeat, no request by the Department of Agriculture has come to us for these additional millions of dollars.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Surely.

Mr. BARRETT. As I understand from Mr. Triner, who is the Director of the Food Distribution Branch of the Department of Agriculture, he had come on numerous occasions and asked to bring the program up to \$100,000,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. You could bring this program up to \$200,000,000 and still would not satisfy everybody on this school lunch program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is impossible to put all of the money asked for in every section of the country. This \$84,000,000 is simply an incentive to get the States to do what they should do and as a consequence we have a program now of over half a billion dollars in progress in America.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield briefly please.

Mr. BARRETT. This was quite a comprehensive program, broken down into three stages, A, B, and C. The A program gives them a full meal—

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield for such a lengthy statement.

I want to conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that it should be mainly the responsibility of the States to put up more money as this program proceeds. The States should put up more money if they are interested, for there most certainly is a limit to what the Federal Government can do with a \$260,000,000,000 public debt. Much as we think of the school lunch program, there is a limit to our ability to contribute. The poor children, unable to buy hot lunches today, have them furnished free in practically every community of our Nation. That is as it should be. My subcommittee has built this great program of assistance to school children in America through the incentives furnished through the generous appropriations we have sponsored. There is a limit—I repeat, Mr. Chairman, and I ask the committee to defeat this fly-by-night amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BARRETT and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 64, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to call attention to an item that appears on page 43 of this bill in the amount of \$6,489,954 that you have agreed to pay as claims allowed by the Motor Carriers Claims Commission to certain motor carriers because they were taken over by the Government during a period from August 11, 1944, to October 4, 1945. Being a period of less than 14 months. It appears the reason for taking over these carriers was to prevent a stoppage by strike during the war. After a wage settlement was made the Government stepped out of the business. I am in-

formed that the taking over of the property was a formal one under Executive order. The lines were run as they had done before. There were a few managers in uniform and certain additional accountings were required.

Mr. Chairman, I realize it is late now to call attention to these matters. This bill has been filed only 3 days. There is little, if any, testimony before the committee on these items. I call attention to this matter because the total in the item is a good sized one. Furthermore there is dissenting opinion filed each of the several claims filed hereunder. These opinions are filed by one of the three Commissioners, Hon. Randolph Carpenter. He is a former Member of this House and an able lawyer.

Another reason why this matter should be called to the attention of Congress is these claims amounting to millions of dollars are chargeable against the Government, does it not raise a question of claims being filed by other transportation companies where such company operations are taken over because of a threat of strikes, or for other reasons. Then, what about the taking over of the steel industry because of dispute between the employer and employees. In any event, I deem it worth while to call these matters to your attention. Mr. Randolph's opinion on one of these claims is included herewith. The other opinions are similar. In this particular case the amount allowed was \$149,921.47.

The findings of the Commission in this case are by no means complete. In my opinion, based upon the record, the following findings of fact should be made in this case:

FINDINGS OF FACT

The evidence does not establish that the petitioner suffered any pecuniary loss due to any action on the part of the Government. On the contrary, the action taken by the Government enabled the petitioner to continue operation of its system and the profits earned during the period August 11, 1944, to October 4, 1945, were more than they would have been if the Government had taken no such action.

On August 12 and 13, 1944, pursuant to a notice issued by the Midwest Operators Association, a meeting was held at Minneapolis, Minn., and was attended by representatives of a large number of the motor-carrier members of the association, including a representative of petitioner. It was also attended by Mr. Longenecker and by Mr. Roddewig, the general counsel of the Office of Defense Transportation.

At the meeting Mr. Roddewig read Executive Order No. 9462 and Mr. Longenecker read Operations Order No. 1. Mr. Longenecker stated that he hoped the existing managements would continue to operate the truck lines just as they had been doing.

Mr. Longenecker did not state at this meeting that the Government was taking physical possession of the transportation system of petitioner or their properties, or that the lines would be run for the account of the Government.

Mr. Longenecker and Mr. Roddewig stated at this meeting that they did not consider that the carriers would be compensated, and that they had no authority to commit the Government to pay compensation.

The Federal Manager exercised no affirmative control over operation of the transportation system of petitioner; on the other hand, he and his representatives assisted petitioner in the resumption and continua-

tion of its operations in furtherance of the war effort.

The United States did not take physical possession or control of the petitioner or any of its properties.

No representative of the United States occupied petitioner's offices or other property.

The Federal manager did not inform petitioner that he was acting as manager of its business or property and did not appoint anyone as manager of petitioner.

The Federal manager did not require that signs be placed on petitioner's trucks with respect to possession or title being in the United States.

The Federal manager did not assert or claim that petitioner or its property was immune from State or local laws, licenses, regulations, or taxes.

The Federal manager did not state to any officers or employees of petitioner that they were acting as representatives of the United States.

Petitioner's officers and directors continued in office after August 11, 1944, and performed the same supervisory and managerial functions they had previously performed. The Federal manager made no attempt to displace or remove them.

The Federal manager did not exercise any control over petitioner with respect to retaining, hiring, or discharging its employees. He did not issue any instructions that they were Government employees or that they were exempt from State social security, unemployment compensation, or workmen's compensation laws.

The Federal manager did not attempt to exercise any control over petitioner's regular bank account, its cash or intangible assets, or its operation revenues or accounts receivable. Petitioner's revenues were not treated as being received for the account of the United States.

The Federal manager did not issue any orders to petitioner with regard to the routes over which it operated, the kinds of traffic it carried, or what shippers it served.

The Federal manager did not exercise any control over petitioner with respect to the purchase of equipment.

The Federal manager did not advise the petitioner that a refusal on its part to follow any directive or recommendation of the Government would subject it to possible civil or criminal prosecution; no threats of this type were made at any time.

During the period of governmental supervision, the Federal manager did not interfere with petitioner's conduct of its labor negotiations, either individual or collective.

Accounting Circular No. 1 did not require petitioner to set up a new set of books or to maintain records which it was not already maintaining, nor did it involve any additional expense to petitioner.

There is no evidence that the issuance of Executive Order No. 9462 or the actions of respondent taken pursuant thereto had any adverse effect on petitioner's credit standing.

There was an increase in operating costs during 1944 and 1945 which was caused in large part by economic factors affecting not only petitioner but motor carriers generally throughout the country. The strikes of petitioner's drivers before August 11, 1944 and after October 4, 1945 had the effect of increasing the operating ratio of petitioner.

On August 11, 1944, the vehicular equipment of petitioner was generally in a poor state of repair as a result of insufficient replacement and lack of proper maintenance.

During 1944 and 1945, motor carriers throughout the country experienced abnormally high repair expenses. There is no evidence that during the period of Government control petitioner's motor equipment experienced usage which necessitated greater expense than that experienced by other

carriers not affected by Executive Order No. 9462.

Except for normal wear and tear, petitioner's motor equipment was in as good condition on October 4, 1945 as it was on August 11, 1944.

On August 11, 1944, the rental rates for all commercial motor vehicles were under the control of the Federal Government. Revised maximum price regulation 165 of the Office of Price Administration, which was in effect on August 11, 1944, prescribed the maximum amount for which commercial motor vehicles could be rented.

The ceiling or maximum under revised maximum price regulation 165 of the Office of Price Administration, for which petitioner could have rented any of its tractor-trailer units on August 11, 1944, was an amount which would produce a net return to the petitioner, on the average, of 2 cents per mile for each tractor-trailer unit, after paying all expenses and after deducting depreciation.

The fair market rental value of the average tractor-trailer unit owned by petitioner would produce a net return of 2 cents per mile to the owner, after payment of all expenses of the owner in connection with the leasing thereof and after deducting depreciation on the vehicle, if rented on August 11, 1944, and during the period ending October 4, 1945.

If petitioner had leased out the tractor-trailer units owned by petitioner on August 11, 1944, they would have been used, on the average, 50,000 miles per year.

The transference of petitioner's vehicles from the common carrier field into the rental field, an unreasonable hypothesis, if done, would have been concomitant with a similar transference by other carriers named in Executive Order 9462. As a matter of basic economics such wholesale or large scale transference on August 11, 1944, or thereafter would have satiated the market and depressed the market rentals.

On August 11, 1944, the total assets of petitioner, according to its own books and records, were \$567,734.60 and on September 30, 1945, were \$591,316.18.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the evidence and the findings of fact, I would accordingly make the following conclusions in this case:

The Commission has jurisdiction over the petitioner's claim and over the parties to this proceeding.

There was no taking of the transportation system or property of petitioner within the meaning of the fifth amendment. Whatever control was exercised over petitioner by the Federal Government on and after August 11, 1944, was an exercise of the Government's regulatory powers.

If there were a taking of petitioner's transportation system or property by the respondent on August 11, 1944, it was a mere technical taking and petitioner is entitled only to the pecuniary loss suffered by the petitioner as a direct result of the taking. The petitioner did not prove the amount of such pecuniary loss or that it suffered any such loss as a result of the taking.

Even if there were a taking of possession of petitioner's transportation system and property, the petitioner has failed to prove any amount of just compensation in excess of the losses it would have sustained if the Government had taken no action whatever.

If there were a taking, it was the petitioner's business as a whole operation which was taken and not merely its equipment.

If there were a taking, the proper measure of compensation is not the fair and reasonable rental value of petitioner's separate items of equipment.

OPINION

The holding in this determination is based upon the opinion filed by the writer

in the case of *Hawkeye Motor Express, Inc. v. The United States*, decided by this Commission.

There was no evidence introduced in this case to sustain a fifth amendment taking by the Government of petitioner's truck line other than the promulgation of the Executive order and ensuing orders, all of which were set out in the Hawkeye case.

There being nothing more, in my opinion, the same would not constitute such a taking as to entitle petitioner to compensation under the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States. The majority of the Commission has found otherwise and has held that petitioner is entitled to a fair market or rental value for the use of its property. In my opinion, even if there was a taking in this case, fair rental value is not the proper measure of compensation. The only compensation to which petitioner would be entitled would be extra losses over what would have otherwise been sustained which were occasioned by the Government's operations. Such has not been established in this case.

There can be no doubt and the evidence substantiates the fact that had petitioner not been enabled to resume its business on August 11, 1944, after the strike was called on August 4, 1944, it would have suffered heavy losses. The action by the Government in assisting petitioner to resume operations was, therefore, certainly beneficial to petitioner. As pointed out in the dissenting opinion in the Hawkeye case, page 37, petitioner cannot claim damages for some speculative profit in an endeavor in which it was not engaged. The net result is that petitioner not only did not suffer any losses by the Government's action herein, but actually was greatly benefited on a dollar and cents basis. (See Findings of Fact No. 1 this opinion.)

Therefore, it is my opinion that the judgment in this case should be in favor of the respondent.

ORDER

Let this determination be filed with the clerk of the commission. The clerk is directed to give notice of the filing hereof to the parties by serving copy on attorneys of record, either personally or by mail.

Done at Kansas City, Mo., this 15th day of April 1952.

THOMAS W. O'HARA,
Chairman.

ERNEST M. SMITH,
Commissioner.

RANDOLPH CARPENTER,
Commissioner.

I, Frances N. Heiman, acting clerk of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of final determination of the Commission in the case of *Murphy Motor Freight Lines, Inc. vs. The United States*, case No. 61, as same was filed with me on the 15th day of April 1952, and as appears of file in my office.

Dated this 15th day of April 1952.

FRANCES N. HEIMAN,
Acting Clerk of the Commission.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Labor to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purpose of this appropriation, \$1,750,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Page 41, after line 18, insert:

"ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Economic Stabilization Agency, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Administrator for such purposes as he deems proper; and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; including expenses of liquidation of those agencies whose operations and functions will expire prior to June 30, 1953; \$57,130,000: *Provided*, That of this amount \$11,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Rent Stabilization, of which \$2,000,000 shall be placed in reserve under the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to be released by the Director of the Budget only on his determination that the workload of the agency so requires.

"GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"For an additional amount for 'Emergency operating expenses,' \$5,000,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available only to enable the General Services Administration to carry out its functions arising out of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended."

[Mr. WHITTEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.), including purchase (not to exceed eight) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of employees occupying positions of critical importance from the standpoint of national security; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with civil-defense functions; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; not to exceed \$9,000 for the purchase of newspapers, periodicals, and teletype-news services; and not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Administrator for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$8,000,000.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to this section of the bill and to urge the House to provide adequate funds to carry on our civil-defense program. However, realizing the absolute hopelessness of such a request in the present temper of the House, in the interest of conserving time I will not do so just now.

Mr. Chairman, in a recent action, this House voted some \$45,000,000,000 for

military appropriations. That action was taken because most of our Members are convinced that there is a realistic threat of war with Communist Russia. By this appropriation action for the military, we are doing our best to bolster our military defenses to help stave off that war by building strength of arms.

By the same token, those funds will be used in the active military defense of this Nation if the Kremlin does decide to go to war on a global scale.

By this and other actions, this House and its members have consistently recognized the fact that there is a possibility of war, if not a strong probability of war—and when and if that war comes, we must be prepared as best we can throughout our total security program.

For that reason, I read with alarm the supplemental appropriations bill which almost completely degouted the national civil defense program. If I read my figures correctly, the committee recommended a slash of better than 93 percent in the funds requested for this major portion of our national security effort.

This national civil defense program is so vital that Gen. George C. Marshall, while serving as Secretary of Defense, called it an urgent military necessity.

In his statement to the Congress last fall, General Marshall said:

I have consistently advocated a strong civil defense for this Nation as an urgent and continuing necessity. I consider that the build-up of civilian capabilities in this field is essential not only from a humanitarian standpoint, but as a military necessity.

May I remind you again that only recently we voted a total of some \$45,000,000,000 for our active military efforts. Yet civil defense which started far behind the military in building up its mobilization base and capabilities and which is less than 2 years old, is today faced with a cut of 93 percent of its requested funds. This comes on top of a severe cut last year of 85 percent.

I hope that the Members recognize that this committee action virtually puts civil defense out of business as a part of our security effort. This simply means that we are under cutting this tremendous investment which we have made.

Here is what Gen. Omar Bradley, the respected Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had to say to the Congress on the need for civil defense from a military standpoint:

A competent civil-defense organization must be prepared to save lives as well as to restore factories to maximum production and resume communications in the shortest possible time. The military will be unable to direct this effort.

We must have, then, an organization in being, planned and staffed beforehand to take over in the event of such an emergency. If civil defense does not function effectively, our defense efforts will be very adversely affected.

It must be apparent to the Members that the civil-defense program which was set up by this Congress in Public Law 920, can hardly be an effective organization in any sense of the word with two severe slashes in its funds.

The report of Mr. CANNON's committee, which is generally commendatory to the FCDA in its language, makes this statement:

The funds recommended represent continued implementation of the concept of civil defense envisaged by the committee and the Congress in making appropriations for this agency in the past two fiscal years. The continued development of this program together with the proper coordination of the civil-defense programs of the various States should provide a realistic civil-defense plan without the expenditure of large sums of money.

Realizing how many billions we have invested in military defense, and the fact that there is a constant Russian threat to our shores, the least we can do for this agency is to give it the same amount of funds voted last year—\$75,000,000.

As I have said, I was prepared to introduce amendments to H. R. 8370 to effect this extremely modest increase in civil-defense funds which will at least enable this new agency, still suffering from last year's appropriation reduction, to carry on its current program which has proven sound and effective. Unfortunately, the House does not seem to realize the importance of civil defense and it would take more than the pleas of a few of us to awaken it to its responsibility to provide adequate safeguards for American lives in the event of an attack. I am sorry this is the situation.

Despite the tremendous responsibilities placed on the FCDA by this Congress in Public Law 920, FCDA has been and will continue to be one of the smallest agencies in Government. Further, even with the \$75,000,000 which this Congress voted for civil defense last year, it has been able to make substantial progress against remarkable odds.

Under the title of "Operations" for this agency, I recommend a very limited increase of \$3,000,000 to be added to the \$8,000,000 which the Appropriations Committee has voted.

In reviewing the testimony on civil defense, and particularly the report of the committee, I was surprised at the committee's handling of the civil defense stockpiling program.

This Congress recognized the urgent need for stockpiling, primarily of medical supplies last year when it voted \$50,000,000 to the agency for this purpose. These funds were not voted to FCDA until November of 1951. It was impossible for the agency to proceed before that on procurement of the stockpile items.

Immediately upon receipt of these funds, the agency began working with the Department of Defense to work out a joint procurement program which would be noncompetitive within the Government. Despite these handicaps, FCDA was able to obligate all of the \$50,000,000 which this Congress voted for medical supplies, plus some \$8,000,000 which reverted from the medical matching program with the States. FCDA was able to obligate every cent of the money which this Congress voted to get started on this continuing program of building up adequate medical stockpiles in case of attack.

These facts are not evident in the committee report. Instead, it seems that they have emphasized only the amount which had actually been expended during the fiscal year which gives a distorted picture of what was actually accomplished.

In order to continue this building up of Federal reserves of medical stockpiles, it is my recommendation that the House add \$34,500,000 under a new subheading, "Emergency supplies and equipment." The vast majority of this sum would be used for the stockpiling of blood and blood derivatives for war emergency purposes. I hardly need emphasize here the urgent needs for blood and plasma. Unless this amount is restored, there are no other funds available, even to the military, for this crucial program.

I feel that we are really gambling with American lives and with the billions we have invested in military defense if the House does not at least give FCDA the same amount of funds, limited though they are, that the Congress voted last year.

Recognizing the Russian armament buildup and the strong support which the civil defense program has received from the two eminent military authorities, General Marshall and General Bradley, the least we can do is vote a total of \$75,000,000 for the continuation of the national civil defense program on its current scale of operation.

I am prepared to offer amendments to that effect.

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise again to repeat what I have been saying on this floor and in speeches in my district and elsewhere since the President's announcement in 1949 that the Russians had exploded an atomic bomb. It is my firm conviction we are being very naive and unrealistic in our civil-defense program.

It is very clear to me now that we will not have adequate appropriations to implement the civil-defense needs of the dangerous days in which we live until certain steps are taken on the highest national levels. These are more active leadership on the part of the President, more interest and assistance on the part of the Defense Establishment, a more articulate presentation to congressional committees on the part of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and a growing realization by Members of Congress that it can happen here in our America.

Having returned recently from visiting our fighting men on the battlefields of Korea, it sickens me that we at home are so apathetic and unconcerned about the facts of life.

(Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we are all interested in an adequate civil-defense program. That in-

terest certainly is no monopoly of those who urge bigger and better appropriations for the Civil Defense Administration.

The impression that I gained last year as a member of the Emergency Agencies Subcommittee of Appropriations was that there was a desire on the part of the Civil Defense Administration officials to do some empire building. Their plans were grandiose and expensive, in some cases duplicative. Many employees of high classifications and high salaries were sought. This situation made it necessary to do some rather sharp trimming.

This year the officials who came before the subcommittee appeared not to have amended their attitude. There seemed to be a willingness, yes, even an affirmative desire, to build a large bureaucracy to handle civil defense. I think the subcommittee acted wisely in denying a huge build-up of personnel and denying huge stockpiles of materials which in many cases would duplicate similar stocks of existing supplies or would be subject to deterioration.

This week a glaring case of personnel build-up came to my attention. My informant was a Reserve Air Force officer now on active duty at a base in one of the Southern States. I quote from the letter of this officer, a civic-minded civilian at heart from my home community:

A matter has come to my attention in the past week which I merely want to give you for your information. I presume the whole thing smells of politics throughout.

Recently, a civilian reported into our headquarters here. He uncovered officials orders of the Office of Federal Civil Defense Administration assigning him to this headquarters as their representative in this office. At that time, we in this Air Division knew nothing about his proposed duties, nor did we know that he was to be assigned to this headquarters. Upon evaluation of the duties which he is assigned to perform, it may be said that these duties are normally performed in our unit by a noncommissioned officer or junior ranking company-grade officer at the most. This man is a GS-13 civil-service employee hired for this position specifically. He informs us that he is to be bulwarked by four additional assistants holding the grade of GS-12. His functions place him in my operations section as a liaison adviser to one of my staff officers.

Here is a man with four assistants each of them drawing more pay from the Federal Government than my commanding general and having very little or no responsibilities comparatively speaking.

Similar personnel are being assigned throughout the Air Defense Command in its 11 air divisions; going back to second-grade arithmetic, I compute that the cost to the Government for these liaison personnel is roughly \$500,000 per year. Lord knows what kind of an empire they have built up in higher headquarters.

The functions of these people can be carried out by a noncommissioned officer. The responsibility in no way measures up to the amount of money they are being paid.

Mr. Chairman, this is a specific demonstration of the general impression which the members of the emergency agencies received. There is indeed a place for a civil-defense organization, but we must be careful that the funds appropriated for that purpose are not used for

the building of a huge and inefficient bureaucracy. I trust the Members of the House will not attempt to substitute their less-informed opinions for the informed decisions of the members of the subcommittee who brought this portion of the bill before us.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are appropriating large sums of money today, and have in the past, for the buildup of the security of this Nation—at home and abroad—to the point where we can adequately defend our democratic way of life against the Communist world around us.

I am at a loss to understand the recent action on the part of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, in apologizing before a closed session of the House of Commons in London because of Gen. Mark Clark's decision to bomb the Korean electrical power stations out of commission.

While millions of Americans will agree with me, nevertheless, I want to emphasize that I am speaking only for myself. As far as I am concerned, Acheson need not apologize either for General Clark's action or for failing to send a telegram of his intentions to the British Government in London. Does this apology on the part of Acheson mean that, in the future, we are going to notify the British Government what our military strategy is going to be, thereby permitting information to leak out to the enemy in time to permit the enemy's Air Force to thwart the attack?

Right here and now I want to reiterate that we neither owe Great Britain nor any political party in Great Britain, and for that matter any one else in the United Nations any apologies for our actions in recent days. If we must apologize to someone, then I say the only one entitled to an apology is Gen. Douglas MacArthur who recommended such action well over a year ago and got fired as a result. This defense of General MacArthur is made again on my responsibility. I am not defending General MacArthur as a Republican but I am defending him as an American. There is no question in the minds of millions of Americans, and certainly not in my mind, that if his advice had been heeded, we would not have the present muddled Korean situation—this albatross around our neck.

If we had listened not only to the greatest of our military leaders but perhaps one of the most outstanding Americans, the Chinese Reds would never have been given their good old sweet time to replace obsolete aircraft with MIG jets.

Could there be anything more disgusting than to hear certain British left-wingers gloat over the fact that they actually participated in MacArthur's dismissal? The American people are at the ends of their temper, and are sick and tired of this Nation being held up to ridicule and scorn when we are paying a mighty expensive price in lives and money for the conduct of a war which we are supposed to run but which the British are running.

I want to come back to Mr. Dean Acheson. Has the Secretary of State, by

his apology to the British Government, entered into a new appeasement arrangement? If so, any such secret arrangement should be repudiated upon his return. Since British opinion seems to be in opposition to any military measures which might bring this horrible fiasco to a conclusion, the new understanding which Mr. Acheson is said to have reached must involve further appeasement. Such an arrangement will lead to nothing but an eventual settlement on Communist terms at the expense of the American people.

Was it not this British limited war strategy that led us into this disgraceful and bloody stalemate?

Recent statistics will show that our casualties, around 110,000, outnumber British casualties about 40 to 1. The death toll lists 19,469 Americans and only 513 British. This is very serious as far as the American people are concerned. Can anyone dispute that more American lives will be lost the longer this now pointless law continues?

How many more American lives must be sacrificed before this great Government of the United States of America comes to its senses and allows American military leaders to end this war in an American way?

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I am this day introducing a resolution which will direct the Secretary of State to disclose complete information with respect to any agreements or understandings which he may have entered into with the Government of Great Britain on his latest visit, and which may affect the conduct of the war in Korea. This resolution is similar to one adopted by this House on February 20, 1952, and which had my support. It is important and I sincerely trust that it will be given immediate consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1214. The appropriations, authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this act or any regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1953 which has not been enacted into law prior to July 1, 1952, shall be available from and including such date for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations, authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1952, and the date of enactment of this act or the applicable act in anticipation of such appropriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the respective terms thereof.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 51, after line 9, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1215. Foreign credits owed to or owned by the United States Treasury will not be available for expenditure by agencies of the United States after June 30, 1953, except as may be provided for annually in appropriation acts and provisions for the utilization of such credits for purposes authorized by law are hereby authorized to be included in general appropriation acts."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I have taken up this amendment with the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr.

TABER]. I have taken it up also with the other gentlemen on the committee on both sides, and all agreed to it. This deals with the currency of foreign governments made available for the use of the United States, which stems from surplus property credits, lend lease, mutual security agency counterpart funds, occupation costs borne by former enemies. These funds have now been accumulating for several years and involve hundreds of millions of dollars. In most instances these foreign currencies are being made available to agencies without the approval of the Congress. This provision would place control in the hands of the Congress through annual appropriations. Agencies of the Government having need for currencies of foreign countries would advise the Congress as to the amount and purposes for which the need appeared. The Congress would then appropriate dollars for the purchase of foreign currencies standing to our credit in the United States Treasury. It is anticipated that considerable savings will result from the congressional control established by this provision. The provision is effective after the fiscal year 1953 so the regular budget for fiscal year 1954 will carry in dollars the estimated foreign currency needs of agencies operated abroad. Unless appropriated for the purchase of these currencies, they would go back to the United States Treasury. It would merely be a book-keeping account, and it would give the Congress control of the money in these foreign countries.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment is very satisfactory to me, but I would like to have it clear in my mind. As I understand it, these agencies can use a certain portion of the counterpart funds. Does this prohibit them from using those funds unless they are appropriated by the Congress?

Mr. RABAUT. It brings this money within the control of the Treasury, and within the knowledge of the Congress in the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What happens then to the money that is in the counterpart funds bank in the different countries? Can they authorize or can our State Department or Mutual Security Agency authorize that to be spent for some other purpose in these countries?

Mr. RABAUT. Under this amendment, it should be made known to us after this becomes effective what needs they have for this money so that the Congress will have some control.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then it will not cost us actually any more dollars because the funds will be available of the counterpart funds as provided in the appropriation bill by the Congress; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely right and we will be saving money by this operation because we will have control of the funds.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. This amendment refers to credit owed to or owned by the United States Treasury. So far as I know there are no counterpart funds owed or owned by the United States Treasury so I do not know of any money in the world except some sort of foreign credit that I have not heard about that are owed or owned by the United States Treasury.

Mr. RABAUT. This is foreign currencies in the foreign countries.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Why there are all sorts of things like this lend lease money and money from the sale of all sorts of property and surplus property, which took place after the war, and there are four or five other funds of different kinds which are scattered all over the world. There is no control over this money, but there ought to be a control and the amendment which the gentleman has offered will bring the money under the control of the Congress so that the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives can keep it from being wasted.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made previously in Committee of the Whole.)

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent to return to page 13, line 12.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. TABER. I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves the right to object. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 13, after line 12, insert:

"COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

"Appropriations available to the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, for fiscal year 1952, shall remain available until September 30, 1952."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan to return to page 13?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply permits the Commission to conclude its operations by the 30th of September and make its final report.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8370) making appropriations to supply certain supplemental and deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Crawford amendment on page 29, line 25, cutting the military assistance from \$3,273,000,000 to \$3,128,000,000.

I ask for a separate vote on the Curtis amendment on page 30, line 18, cutting the military assistance, title II, from \$630,316,500 to \$499,116,500.

And on the Davis amendment, on page 32, line 7, cutting the technical assistance from \$118,634,250 to \$67,793,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: On page 29, line 25, strike out "\$3,273,824,750" and insert "\$3,128,224,750."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken and the Chair announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 167, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—172

Abblitt	Armstrong	Bishop
Adair	Ayres	Blackney
Allen, Calif.	Baker	Bolton
Allen, Ill.	Barden	Bow
Andersen,	Bates, Mass.	Boykin
H. Carl	Beall	Bramblett
Anderson Calif.	Bender	Bray
Andresen,	Bennett, Mich.	Brehm
August H.	Berry	Brownson
Angell	Betts	Budge

Buffett
 Busbey
 Bush
 Butler
 Byrnes
 Carrigg
 Chenoweth
 Chipewfield
 Church
 Cleveland
 Cole, Kans.
 Corbett
 Cotton
 Crawford
 Crumpacker
 Cunningham
 Curtis, Mo.
 Curtis, Nebr.
 Dague
 Davis, Ga.
 Davis, Wis.
 Denny
 D'Ewart
 Dolliver
 Dondero
 Dorn
 Elisworth
 Elston
 Engle
 Gamble
 Gavin
 George
 Golden
 Goodwin
 Graham
 Gross
 Hagen
 Halleck
 Hand
 Harden
 Harrison, Nebr.
 Harrison, Va.
 Harrison, Wyo.
 Harvey
 Hays, Ohio
 Hess
 Hill
 Hillings
 Hinshaw

Andrews
 Auchincloss
 Bailey
 Bakewell
 Baring
 Barrett
 Battle
 Bennett, Fla.
 Bentsen
 Boggs, La.
 Bolling
 Bosone
 Brooks
 Brown, Ga.
 Bryson
 Buchanan
 Burleson
 Burnside
 Burton
 Camp
 Canfield
 Cannon
 Case
 Chatham
 Chelf
 Chudoff
 Colmer
 Cooley
 Cooper
 Cox
 Crosser
 Dawson
 Deane
 DeGraffenried
 Delaney
 Denton
 Devereux
 Dingell
 Dollinger
 Doyle
 Durham
 Eberharter
 Elliott
 Feighan
 Fernandez
 Fine
 Fisher
 Flood
 Fogarty
 Forand
 Ford
 Forrester
 Fugate
 Fuiton
 Garmatz
 Gary

Hoeven
 Hoffman, Ill.
 Hoffman, Mich.
 Holmes
 Horan
 Hurl
 Hunter
 Jackson, Calif.
 Jenison
 Jenkins
 Jensen
 Jonas
 Jones
 Jones, Woodrow W.
 Keating
 Kersten, Wis.
 Latham
 LeCompte
 Love
 Lucas
 McConnell
 McCulloch
 McDonough
 McGregor
 McIntire
 McMillan
 McVey
 Mack, Wash.
 Martin, Iowa
 Martin, Mass.
 Mason
 Meader
 Miller, Md.
 Miller, Nebr.
 Miller, N. Y.
 Mumma
 Murray
 Nelson
 Nicholson
 Norblad
 Norrell
 O'Hara
 O'Konski
 Osmer
 Ostertag
 Passman
 Patten
 Patterson
 Phillips

NAYS—167

Gathings
 Gordon
 Granahan
 Granger
 Grant
 Green
 Greenwood
 Gregory
 Hale
 Hardy
 Harris
 Hart
 Havenner
 Hays, Ark.
 Hedrick
 Herlong
 Heseltun
 Hollfield
 Hope
 Howell
 Ikard
 Irving
 Jarman
 Javits
 Johnson
 Jones, Ala.
 Jones, Mo.
 Karsten, Mo.
 Kearns
 Kee
 Kelley, Pa.
 Kelly, N. Y.
 Kennedy
 Keogh
 Kerr
 Kilday
 King, Calif.
 Klein
 Lane
 Lanham
 Lantaff
 Lesinski
 Lind
 McCarthy
 McCormack
 McGrath
 McGuire
 McKinnon
 McMullen
 Mack, Ill.
 Madden
 Magee
 Mahon
 Mansfield
 Marshall
 Merrow

Poulson
 Radwan
 Rankin
 Redden
 Reed, Ill.
 Reed, N. Y.
 Rees, Kans.
 Riehlman
 Robeson
 Rogers, Mass.
 Ross
 Sadlak
 St. George
 Saylor
 Schenck
 Scribner
 Scudder
 Secrest
 Shafer
 Sheehan
 Short
 Simpson, Ill.
 Simpson, Pa.
 Sittler
 Smith, Kans.
 Springer
 Stockman
 Taber
 Talle
 Taylor
 Teague
 Thompson, Mich.
 Tollefson
 Van Pelt
 Van Zandt
 Velde
 Vorys
 Vursell
 Welch
 Werdel
 Wheeler
 Williams, Miss.
 Williams, N. Y.
 Withrow
 Wolcott
 Wolverson
 Wood, Idaho

Miller, Calif.
 Mills
 Morgan
 Morton
 Moulder
 Multer
 Murdock
 Murphy
 O'Brien, Ill.
 O'Brien, Mich.
 O'Brien, N. Y.
 O'Neill
 O'Toole
 Patman
 Poage
 Polk
 Preston
 Price
 Priest
 Prouty
 Rabaut
 Rains
 Reams
 Rhodes
 Ribicoff
 Riley
 Rivers
 Roberts
 Rodino
 Rogers, Colo.
 Rogers, Fla.
 Rooney
 Scott
 Hugh D., Jr.
 Shelley
 Sheppard
 Sleminski
 Smith, Miss.
 Smith, Va.
 Spence
 Staggers
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Trimble
 Walter
 Watts
 Whitten
 Widnall
 Wier
 Wigglesworth
 Wilson, Tex.
 Winstead
 Wood, Ga.
 Yates
 Yorty
 Zablocki

NOT VOTING—92

Aandahl
 Abernethy
 Addonizio
 Albert
 Allen, La.
 Anfuso
 Arends
 Aspinall
 Bates, Ky.
 Beamer
 Beckworth
 Belcher
 Blatnik
 Boggs, Del.
 Bonner
 Brown, Ohio
 Buckley
 Burdick
 Carlyle
 Carnahan
 Celler
 Clemente
 Cole, N. Y.
 Combs
 Coudert
 Davis, Tenn.
 Dempsey
 Donohue
 Donovan
 Doughton
 Eaton
 Evins
 Fallon
 Fenton
 Frazier
 Furcolo
 Gore
 Gwinn
 Hall
 Edwin Arthur
 Leonard W.
 Hebert
 Heffernan
 Heller
 Herter
 Jackson, Wash.
 James
 Jones
 Hamilton C.
 Judd
 Kean
 Kearney
 Kilburn
 King, Pa.
 Kirwan
 Kluczynski
 Larcade
 Lyle
 Machrowicz
 Mitchell
 Morano
 Morris
 Morrison

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
 Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Vinson against.
 Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Addonizio against.
 Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
 Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Heller against.
 Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.
 Mr. Hebert for, with Mr. Donohue against.
 Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Sabath against.
 Mr. Belcher for, with Mr. Judd against.
 Mr. Vall for, with Mr. Coudert against.
 Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Morrison against.
 Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Perkins against.
 Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.
 Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Blatnick against.
 Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Buckley against.
 Mr. King of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Celler against.
 Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Clemente against.
 Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.
 Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Jackson of Washington against.
 Mr. Wilson of Indiana for, with Mr. Mitchell against.
 Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Until further notice:
 Mr. Welch with Mr. Aandahl.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.
 Mr. Morris with Mr. Herter.
 Mr. Wickersham with Mr. James.
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Fenton.
 Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Donovan with Mr. Cole of New York.
 Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Morano.
 Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Potter.
 Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Seely-Brown.
 Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is amended.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 30, line 18, strike out "\$530,316,500" and insert "\$399,116,500."
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 160, noes 135.

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 32, line 7, strike out "\$118,634,250" and insert "\$67,793,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 171, noes 121.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.
 So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am, Mr. Speaker.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
 Mr. CLEVENGER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers in the bill just passed, H. R. 8370.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed and have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Permission to revise and extend remarks made in the Committee of the Whole on the bill H. R. 8370 was granted to:

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 8370

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 30 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1952

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply sup-
5 plemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1953, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FISCAL SERVICE

10 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Salaries
11 and expenses, Fiscal Service", \$70,000.

1 COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT FUND EXPENSES

2 DISTRICT GOVERNMENT RETIREMENT AND RELIEF FUNDS

3 For an additional amount for "District government re-
4 tirement and relief funds", \$397,000.

5 DISTRICT DEBT SERVICE

6 For reimbursement to the Treasury of the United States
7 for the amount paid to the Pan American Union under the
8 provisions of Public Law 902, approved December 29, 1950,
9 \$54,692.

10 REGULATORY AGENCIES

11 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses for "Office of Administrator of
14 Rent Control", \$125,000, of which not less than \$27,000
15 shall be available for payment of terminal leave only: *Pro-*
16 *vided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon
17 enactment into law of authorizing legislation for the purposes
18 of rent control in the District of Columbia.

19 PUBLIC SCHOOLS

20 OPERATING EXPENSES

21 PUBLIC SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES FUND

22 For crediting to the public school food services fund,
23 in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia

1 Public School Food Services Act (Public Law 159, ap-
2 proved October 8, 1951), \$25,000.

3 OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil Defense,
6 including personal services without reference to the civil
7 service laws as related to recruitment; and services as au-
8 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
9 U. S. C. 55a), \$100,000.

10 REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

11 For payment of per diem for the fiscal year 1952 of
12 members of the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District
13 of Columbia, \$5,020: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
14 also be available for the payment of such per diem for
15 services rendered prior to July 1, 1950.

16 HEALTH DEPARTMENT

17 MEDICAL CHARITIES

18 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "Medi-
19 cal charities", \$92,613.

20 PUBLIC WORKS

21 OPERATING EXPENSES, ELECTRICAL DIVISION

22 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1951, for "Operat-
23 ing expenses, Electrical Division", \$19,341.

1 REPAIRS TO OLD BAY LINE PIER

2 For emergency repairs to Old Bay Line pier, Washing-
3 ton Channel, \$26,700, which amount shall be transferred
4 to the Department of the Army and be expended under the
5 direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision
6 of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until
7 expended.

8 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

9 The sums appropriated in this Act for the District of
10 Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for,
11 be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia,
12 as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts
13 for the fiscal years involved.

14 CHAPTER II

15 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

16 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

17 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

18 Stationery (revolving fund) : For an additional amount
19 for "Stationery (revolving fund)", \$132,200, including an
20 additional stationery allowance of \$300 for each Repre-
21 sentative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from
22 Puerto Rico, for the second session of the Eighty-second
23 Congress, to remain available until expended.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

For an additional amount for "House Office Buildings":
\$48,750.

House Restaurants: For structural and mechanical changes, labor, materials, equipment, and all other necessary items to provide facilities for carry-out food service in the New and Old House Office Buildings, to be operated as part of the House of Representatives restaurants, \$23,000.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport Act", \$585,536, as follows: Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia, \$51,797; Municipal Airport, Hutchinson, Kansas, \$43,961; Salisbury-Wicomico Airport, Salisbury, Maryland, \$25,096; Holman Field, St. Paul, Minnesota, \$174,327; Municipal Airport, Dayton, Ohio, \$289,294; Kitsap County Airport, Kitsap, Washington, \$1,061.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

EMERGENCY FACILITIES, RADIATION PHYSICS LABORATORY

For expenses necessary for construction of a Radium Laboratory and an annex to the Betatron Building,
\$131,000.

CHAPTER IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses",
\$4,500,000.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction,
and improvements", \$5,000,000, to remain available until
expended.

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay", \$600,000.

RESERVE TRAINING

For an additional amount for "Reserve training",
\$100,000.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$14,500,000 (to be computed on an
accrual basis) of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance
Corporation shall be available during the current fiscal year
for its administrative expenses, including hire of passenger
motor vehicles; and use of the services and facilities of the
Federal Reserve banks: *Provided*, That as used herein the

1 term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to include
2 all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract or
3 fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the pur-
4 chase of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices:
5 *Provided further*, That the limiting amount heretofore stated
6 for administrative expenses shall be increased by an amount
7 which does not exceed the aggregate cost of salaries, wages,
8 travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside the
9 continental United States; the expenses of services per-
10 formed on a contract or fee basis in connection with termi-
11 nation of contracts or in the performance of legal services;
12 and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other
13 Government agencies: *Provided further*, That the distribu-
14 tion of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Cor-
15 poration shall be made in accordance with generally recog-
16 nized accounting principles and practices.

17 CHAPTER V

18 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

19 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

20 Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount
21 which may be expended for one passenger motor vehicle
22 (for replacement only) carried under this head in the
23 Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby
24 increased from "\$3,000" to "\$5,000".

1 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
2 GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION
3 AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

4 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for
5 unemployment compensation and employment service admin-
6 istration", \$6,800,000.

7 MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses, not otherwise pro-
9 vided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Depart-
10 ment of Labor under the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public
11 Law 78), including temporary employment of persons with-
12 out regard to the civil service laws, \$2,800,000: *Provided,*
13 That the general provisions applicable to the Department
14 of Labor contained in the Labor-Federal Security Appro-
15 priation Act, 1953, shall apply to the funds appropriated
16 herein in the same manner as if this appropriation were a
17 part of that Act.

18 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

19 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

20 EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

21 For an additional amount for "Education of the Blind",
22 \$60,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
\$60,000.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Payments to school districts", \$11,570,000.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "School construction",
\$80,000,000 to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For additional amounts for increased costs of pay and allowances authorized by Public Law 346, approved May 19, 1952, as follows:

"Venereal diseases", \$16,500;

"Tuberculosis", \$23,250;

"Assistance to States, general", \$37,500;

"Communicable diseases", \$69,750;

"Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene",

\$61,500;

1 “Disease and sanitation investigations and control,
2 Territory of Alaska”, \$7,500;

3 “Salaries and expenses, hospital construction serv-
4 ices”, \$9,000;

5 “Hospitals and medical care”, \$388,000;

6 “Foreign quarantine service”, \$15,000;

7 “National Institutes of Health, operating expenses”,
8 \$48,750;

9 “National Cancer Institute”, \$25,500;

10 “Mental health activities”, \$16,500;

11 “National Heart Institute”, \$22,500;

12 “Dental health activities”, \$20,250;

13 “Retired pay of commissioned officers”, \$36,000;

14 “Salaries and expenses”, \$20,250.

15 HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL CARE

16 For an additional amount for “Hospitals and medical
17 care” \$500,000; and this amount shall be exclusively avail-
18 able for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and
19 treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy.

20 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE COMMUNITY

22 FACILITIES AND SERVICES

23 For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses,
24 Defense Community Facilities and Services”, \$50,000, to
25 be derived by transfer from the appropriation “Defense Com-

1 munity Facilities and Services, Federal Security Agency":
 2 *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this
 3 head shall be obligated after December 31, 1952 except for
 4 liquidation of the program.

5 CHAPTER VI

6 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

7 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

8 CONSTRUCTION

9 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$525,000,
 10 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That restric-
 11 tions contained within the Interior Department Appropria-
 12 tion Act, 1952, limiting the amounts which may be expended
 13 from appropriations to the National Park Service for per-
 14 sonal services, are hereby waived to the extent necessary
 15 to meet the costs of fire suppression and of emergency
 16 reconstruction or replacement of facilities damaged or de-
 17 stroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes.

18 CHAPTER VII

19 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

20 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

21 EXTRAORDINARY ALTERATIONS AND REPAIRS, EXECUTIVE

22 MANSION

23 Not to exceed \$50,000 of funds made available to the
 24 President under the heading "Emergency Fund for the
 25 President, National Defense", contained in the "Independent

1 Offices Appropriation Act, 1953", shall be available until
2 June 30, 1954, for extraordinary alterations, repairs, furni-
3 ture, and furnishings of the Executive Mansion and the
4 White House Office, to be expended as the President may
5 determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any
6 other Act.

7 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

8 DEDICATION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIALS

9 For expenses necessary for an appropriate dedication
10 of World War II memorials, erected under authority of the
11 Act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 123), to be available
12 for such purposes as the Commission may deem necessary
13 and proper and without regard to the provisions of other
14 laws or regulations relating to the expenditure of public
15 funds (except that this exemption shall not be construed as
16 waiving the requirement for the submission of accounts and
17 vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit), \$30,-
18 000, to be immediately available and to remain available
19 until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That, when in the discretion
20 of the American Battle Monuments Commission it would
21 be in the public interest, personnel and transportation facili-
22 ties of any other Government agency may be furnished by
23 such agency, without reimbursement, to the Commission
24 for the purposes of this appropriation.

1 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

2 Operating expenses: For an additional amount for "Op-
3 erating expenses", including the hire of passenger motor
4 vehicles, \$35,000,000, of which \$30,000,000 shall be avail-
5 able only for the weapons program: *Provided*, That appro-
6 priations granted to the Commission under this head for the
7 fiscal year 1953 shall be available in amounts not to exceed
8 \$25,064,275 for expenses of program direction and adminis-
9 tration personnel, and not to exceed \$2,709,350 for expenses
10 of travel.

11 Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for
12 "Plant and equipment", including the purchase (not to ex-
13 ceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor
14 vehicles, \$1,450,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with
15 the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the
16 Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of
17 the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify
18 existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for
19 periods not exceeding twenty-five years, and such contracts
20 shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon pay-
21 ment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and
22 any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to
23 the Commission shall be available for the payment of such
24 cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the fore-

1 going appropriation shall be available for the construction
2 of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project,
3 unless funds are available for the completion of such build-
4 ing, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

5 COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE
6 MANSION

7 Appropriations available to the "Commission on Reno-
8 vation of the Executive Mansion", for fiscal year 1952, shall
9 remain available until September 30, 1952.

10 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

11 HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

12 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions
13 of the Act approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as
14 amended (65 Stat. 657), authorizing the establishment of a
15 hospital center in the District of Columbia, including grants
16 to private agencies for hospital facilities in said District,
17 \$11,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
18 That the foregoing appropriation shall be the total amount to
19 be provided by the Federal Government for the completion
20 of the projects contemplated in connection with such appro-
21 priation: *Provided further*, That appropriations and con-
22 tract authorizations heretofore granted under the head of

1 "Hospital Center, District of Columbia" shall be merged
2 with and accounted for as a part of this appropriation.

3 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

4 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

5 DEFENSE HOUSING

6 For an additional amount for "Defense housing", includ-
7 ing not to exceed \$1,433,735 for administrative expenses
8 of the Public Housing Administration in connection with
9 construction of housing under such appropriation, \$50,-
10 000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,*
11 That the funds hereby appropriated shall not be available
12 in excess of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be
13 appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Agency
14 for defense housing by title III of the Defense Housing
15 and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951: *Pro-*
16 *vided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation
17 shall be used for the construction of any project unless funds
18 are available for the completion of such project. No part
19 of this appropriation may be used for administrative ex-
20 penses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public
21 Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long
22 as that agency proceeds with any public-housing project
23 after such project has been rejected or previous approval
24 thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by

1 resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing
2 body has recognized local liability to reimburse the Federal
3 Government for funds, if any, advanced on such project prior
4 to such cancellations.

5 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

6 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

7 The amount made available under this head in title III
8 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, for
9 administrative expenses of the Federal National Mortgage
10 Association is increased by \$680,000; and the limitation
11 under said head on the amount available for expenses of
12 travel is increased by \$40,800: *Provided*, That this para-
13 graph shall take effect only upon the enactment into law
14 of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress.

15 ALASKA HOUSING

16 For an additional amount for "Alaska housing",
17 \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
18 That this paragraph shall take effect only upon the enact-
19 ment into law of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress.

20 SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

21 CAPITAL GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN

22 REDEVELOPMENT

23 For payment of capital grants as authorized by title I of
24 the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1453,
25 1456), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

1 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 The amount made available under this head in title III
4 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, for
5 administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administra-
6 tion is increased by \$1,433,735; and the limitation under
7 said head on the amount available for expenses of travel is
8 increased by \$88,000.

9 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

10 For an additional amount for "Tennessee Valley
11 Authority", including the purchase of not to exceed an
12 additional seventy passenger motor vehicles, \$85,000,000,
13 to remain available until expended.

14 WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

15 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

16 For an additional amount for "Administrative expenses",
17 \$100,000, to be derived from the war claims fund created
18 by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public
19 Law 896, approved July 3, 1948).

20 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

21 MARITIME ACTIVITIES

22 WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION LIQUIDATION

23 The appropriation made available under this head in the
24 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, shall be avail-

1 able for the payment of obligations incurred against the work-
2 ing fund titled "Working fund, Commerce, War Shipping
3 Administration functions, December 31, 1946".

4 CHAPTER VIII

5 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

6 TITLE I—MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

7 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

8 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

9 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
10 porary or permanent public works, military installations,
11 and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the Act of
12 January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress),
13 the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
14 second Congress), and the Act of ———, 1952 (Public
15 Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), without
16 regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as
17 amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and
18 not to exceed \$5,000,000 for advance planning as authorized
19 by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; \$600,-
20 090,000, to remain available until expended. Of total
21 amount appropriated in this paragraph, \$1,980,000 shall
22 be allocated for Camp Crowder, Missouri.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

PUBLIC WORKS

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the Act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress), and the Act of —, 1952 (Public Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), seal coating for airfield pavements at Naval Station, Adak, Alaska; including not to exceed \$2,500,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; \$210,000 for the acquisition of facilities as authorized by said Act of September 11, 1950; furniture for public quarters; personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engineering and architectural services as authorized by section 3 of the Act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556) ; \$386,409,-840, to remain available until expended.

1 DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

2 ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

3 For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment
4 of temporary or permanent public works, military installa-
5 tions, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the
6 Act of March 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 17), the Act of October
7 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 936), as amended, the Act of June 17,
8 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of
9 January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress),
10 the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
11 second Congress), and the Act of ———, 1952 (Public
12 Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), without
13 regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as
14 amended, and the land, and interests therein, may be ac-
15 quired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior
16 to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required
17 by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; not to exceed
18 \$52,620,000 for planning (including advance planning,
19 master planning, and investigational engineering) as au-
20 thorized by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951;
21 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,200,000,000, to
22 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of
23 these funds shall be expended for actual construction of
24 facilities or structures at Grandview Air Terminal, Missouri,

1 until the city of Kansas City, Missouri, has conveyed to the
2 United States Government the fee simple title to all lands
3 required for the base or has given the United States Govern-
4 ment at least a twenty-five-year lease to such land on a
5 nominal rental basis.

6 SEC. 802. None of the funds appropriated in this title
7 shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee
8 contract for work where cost estimates exceed \$25,000 to
9 be performed within the continental United States without
10 the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense
11 setting forth the reasons therefor.

12 SEC. 803. None of the funds appropriated in this title
13 shall be expended for additonal costs involved in expedit-
14 ing construction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense,
15 or his designee for the purpose, shall establish a reasonable
16 completion date for each project, taking into consideration
17 the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal
18 conditions affecting the construction and the application of
19 economical construction practices.

20 SEC. 804. No part of the funds made available by this
21 or any other Act of the present Congress shall be used for
22 the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery,
23 laundry, or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its
24 Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of De-

1 fense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons there-
2 for, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are
3 not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates.

4 SEC. 805. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall
5 be used to expand the facilities of the Department of the Air
6 Force to establish or maintain a separate system for provid-
7 ing such supplies and services as were furnished to the De-
8 partment of the Air Force by the Department of the Army
9 prior to August 1, 1951.

10 SEC. 806. This title may be cited as the "Military Pub-
11 lic Works Appropriation Act, 1953".

12 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

13 ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

14 CONSTRUCTION

15 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
16 porary or permanent public works, including buildings, facili-
17 ties, appurtenances, and utilities, at stations of the Alaska
18 Communication System, as authorized by the Act of June
19 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), and the Act of October 27,
20 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136
21 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of
22 passenger motor vehicles; \$1,400,000, to remain available
23 until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
24 not be available for construction of family quarters at (1) an
25 average cost in excess of \$26,500 for construction, including

but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of \$5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services therefor and all contingencies: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the funds herein made available shall be available for painting the exterior of the Jesse Lee Children's Home at Seward, Alaska.

CHAPTER IX

MUTUAL SECURITY

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government or occupation of certain foreign areas (except Germany, Japan and Austria), including, subject to such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition, travel expenses, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at

1 rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; trans-
2 lation rights, photographic work, education exhibits, and
3 dissemination of information, including preview and review
4 expenses incident thereto; hire of passenger motor vehicles
5 and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings, utilities,
6 facilities, and appurtenances; not to exceed \$2,000 for con-
7 tingencies for the United States commanders, commissioners,
8 or other administrators of foreign areas, to be expended
9 in their respective discretions; such minimum supplies for
10 the civilian populations of such areas as may be
11 essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prej-
12 udicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; and
13 such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be es-
14 sential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation;
15 \$11,000,000, of which not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be
16 available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the gen-
17 eral provisions of the Appropriation Act for the current fiscal
18 year for the military functions of the Department of the Army
19 shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from
20 this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from
21 this appropriation may be made outside continental United
22 States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without
23 regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised
24 Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or
25 provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a

1 citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That ex-
2 penditures from this appropriation may be made, when
3 necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sec-
4 tion 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed
5 Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151-161):
6 *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made here-
7 under for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in such
8 occupied areas in such manner as to be consistent with the
9 general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948,
10 as amended, and in the manner authorized by section 1111
11 (b) (1) thereof: *Provided further*, That funds appropri-
12 ated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termina-
13 tion of occupation by the United States, of any area for
14 which such funds are made available, may be expended by
15 the President for the procurement of such commodities and
16 technical services, and commodities procured from funds
17 herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief
18 in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior
19 to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized
20 by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the mainte-
21 nance of the political and economic stability of such areas:
22 *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made
23 available, an agreement shall be entered into between the
24 United States and the recognized government or authority

1 with respect to such area containing such undertakings by
2 such government or authority as the President may deter-
3 mine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of
4 such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided*
5 *further*, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include
6 requirements and undertakings corresponding to the re-
7 quirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and
8 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, ap-
9 proved December 17, 1947): *Provided further*, That funds
10 appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable,
11 and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed
12 by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay
13 ocean transportation charges from United States ports,
14 including territorial ports, to ports in the Ryukyus for the
15 movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United
16 States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with
17 and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary
18 Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals re-
19 siding in such areas: *Provided further*, That under the rules
20 and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department
21 or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per
22 pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of
23 food or other general classification of commodities shipped to
24 the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher
25 rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but

1 this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals
2 to individuals: *Provided further*, That the President may
3 transfer to any other department or agency any function or
4 functions provided for under this appropriation, and there
5 shall be transferred to any such department or agency
6 without reimbursement and without regard to the appro-
7 priation from which procured, such property as the Director
8 of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate pri-
9 marily to any function or functions so transferred: *Provided*
10 *further*, That not to exceed \$1,725,000 of the funds appro-
11 priated under this head for the fiscal year 1950, shall remain
12 available until June 30, 1953, for the payment of obliga-
13 tions incurred under contracts executed prior to July 1,
14 1950.

15 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

16 GOVERNMENT IN OCCUPIED AREAS

17 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
18 meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States
19 in Germany and Austria (including those arising under the
20 supreme authority assumed by the United States on June
21 5, 1945, and under contractual arrangements with the
22 Federal Republic of Germany), under such regulations as
23 the Secretary of State may prescribe, including one deputy
24 to the United States chief of mission in Germany at a salary
25 of \$17,500; tuition, travel expenses, health and accident in-

1 surance, fees incident to instruction in the United States or
2 elsewhere, and hospitalization and medical care, including
3 travel of attendants, of such persons as may be required to
4 carry out the provisions of this appropriation; actual expenses
5 of preparing and transporting to their former homes the re-
6 mains of persons who may die away from their homes while
7 participating in activities authorized under this appropriation;
8 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
9 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per
10 diem for individuals; payment of tort claims, in the manner
11 authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended,
12 of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise
13 in foreign countries; expenses for translation and reproduc-
14 tion rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation, and distribu-
15 tion of educational, informational, reorientation, and rehabili-
16 tation materials and equipment for Germany and Austria,
17 including grants; medical and health assistance for the civilian
18 population of Germany and Austria; expenses incident to the
19 operation of schools for American children who are depend-
20 ents of Government personnel; expenses incident to maintain-
21 ing discipline and order (including trial and punishment by
22 courts established by or under authority of the President);
23 printing and binding outside continental United States with-
24 out regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44
25 U. S. C. 111); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance

1 of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices
2 abroad; purchase (including one at not to exceed \$3,600 for
3 replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;
4 transportation to Germany or Austria of property donated
5 for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen contin-
6 gencies (not to exceed \$25,000) for the United States
7 chief of mission in Germany, to be accounted for pur-
8 suant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes
9 (31 U. S. C. 107); and representation allowances (not to
10 exceed \$35,000) similar to those authorized by section 901
11 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C.
12 1131); \$19,000,000: *Provided*, That provisions of law,
13 including current appropriation Acts, applicable to the
14 Department of State shall be available for application to
15 expenditures made from this appropriation: *Provided fur-*
16 *ther*, That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932,
17 as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out
18 the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency
19 may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation:
20 *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation
21 may be made outside the continental United States, when
22 necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sec-
23 tions 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Pro-*
24 *vided further*, That the Department of State is authorized

1 to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation,
2 including unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reim-
3 bursement from this or any other appropriation (1)
4 currencies deposited in Germany by the Federal Re-
5 public of Germany and in Austria by the Republic of
6 Austria in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the
7 Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and
8 which may be made available by the Director for
9 Mutual Security, (2) currencies otherwise deposited in
10 Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany and which be-
11 come available for use of the Government of the United
12 States, its representatives or agencies in Germany, in such
13 quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be
14 determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with
15 the Director for Mutual Security, (3) other currencies de-
16 rived from activities carried on under this appropriation,
17 or in the possession of or under the control of the Depart-
18 ment of State in Germany and Austria, and (4), in the event
19 sufficient currencies are not available from the sources speci-
20 fied in (1), (2), and (3) above, currencies derived from
21 payments by the Federal Republic of Germany and the
22 Republic of Austria to the Government of the United States
23 for surplus property of whatever nature and kind heretofore

1 made available to Germany and Austria, in an amount
2 not to exceed the equivalent of \$25,000,000; however,
3 the foregoing limitation shall not apply to currencies
4 utilized hereunder for United States assistance to Ber-
5 lin: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this
6 appropriation appointments may be made to the Foreign
7 Service Reserve without regard to the four-year limita-
8 tion contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service
9 Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That in the event the
10 President assigns to the Department of State responsi-
11 bilities and obligations of the United States in connection
12 with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas
13 in addition to Germany and Austria, the authorities contained
14 in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of
15 State in connection with such government, occupation, or
16 control of such foreign areas: *Provided further*, That when
17 the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act
18 of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes
19 subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the
20 United States Government serving in Germany and Austria,
21 payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the
22 same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department
23 of the Army serving in Germany and Austria, respectively.

1 **TITLE III—MUTUAL SECURITY**

2 For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry
3 out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Pub-
4 lic Law 165, approved October 10, 1951), as amended, as
5 follows:

6 Military assistance, title I: For assistance authorized by
7 section 101 (a) (1), \$3,128,224,750; and, in addition, un-
8 expended balances of appropriations heretofore made pur-
9 suant to section 101 (a) (1) of said Act shall remain avail-
10 able through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with
11 this appropriation;

12 Economic and technical assistance, title I: For assistance
13 authorized by section 101 (a) (2), \$1,282,433,000; and,
14 in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore
15 made pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of said Act shall
16 remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be con-
17 solidated with this appropriation;

18 Assistance to Spain: Unexpended balances of appropria-
19 tions for "Assistance to Spain", granted in the Mutual Se-
20 curity Appropriation Act of 1952, shall remain available
21 until June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with funds
22 allocated for assistance to Spain pursuant to section 101 (c)
23 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;

24 Military assistance, title II: For assistance authorized

1 by section 201, \$499,116,500; and in addition, unexpended
2 balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to sec-
3 tion 201 of said Act shall remain available through June 30,
4 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;
5 Economic and technical assistance, title II: For assist-
6 ance authorized by section 203, \$50,822,750; and, in addi-
7 tion, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made
8 pursuant to section 203 of said Act (except the amounts
9 allocated or available for the purposes of sections 204 and
10 205 of said Act) shall remain available through June 30,
11 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

12 Palestine refugee assistance, title II: For assistance au-
13 thorized by section 206 for carrying out the purposes of
14 section 204 of said Act, \$60,063,250; and, in addition,
15 unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made avail-
16 able pursuant to section 203 and allocated or otherwise
17 available for the purposes of said section 204 shall remain
18 available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated
19 with this appropriation;

20 Relief and resettlement of refugees entering Israel, title
21 II: For assistance authorized by section 206 for carrying out
22 the purposes of section 205 of said Act, \$70,228,000;

23 Military assistance, title III: For assistance authorized
24 by section 301, \$540,807,500; and, in addition, unexpended

1 balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to sec-
2 tion 301 of said Act shall remain available through June 30,
3 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

4 Economic and technical assistance, title III: (a) For
5 assistance authorized by section 302 (a), to be furnished
6 under the applicable provisions of section 503 of the Mutual
7 Security Act of 1952, \$202,778,250; and, in addition,
8 unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made
9 available pursuant to section 302 of said Act and allocated or
10 otherwise available to the Mutual Security Agency (except
11 unexpended balances of funds allocated for assistance to
12 Burma and Indonesia) shall remain available through June
13 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;
14 (b) For assistance authorized by section 302 (a) to be fur-
15 nished under the applicable provisions of the Act for Interna-
16 tional Development, as amended, \$67,793,000; and, in addi-
17 tion, unexpended balances of (1) appropriations heretofore
18 available pursuant to section 302 of said Act and allocated or
19 otherwise available to the Technical Cooperation Administra-
20 tion, and (2) funds allocated for assistance for Burma and
21 Indonesia, shall remain available through June 30, 1953,
22 and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

23 Contributions to United Nations Korean Reconstruction
24 Agency, title III: The unobligated balances of the appro-

1 appropriations available during the fiscal year 1952 for carrying
2 out section 303 of said Act shall remain available through
3 June 30, 1953;

4 Military assistance, Title IV: For assistance authorized
5 by section 403 to carry out the provisions of section 401 of
6 said Act, \$51,685,750; and, in addition, unexpended bal-
7 ances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said
8 section 401 shall remain available through June 30, 1953,
9 and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

10 Technical assistance, title IV: For assistance authorized
11 by section 403 to carry out the provisions of section 402 of
12 said Act, \$20,329,000; and, in addition, unexpended balances
13 of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said section
14 402 shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and be
15 consolidated with this appropriation;

16 Movement of migrants, title V: For assistance authorized
17 by section 534, \$9,240,500;

18 Ocean freight, voluntary relief packages, title V: For
19 assistance authorized by section 535, \$2,587,500.

20 MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

21 For contributions authorized by section 404 (b) of the
22 Act for International Development, as amended by section
23 10 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, \$9,171,333.

1 CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL
2 CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

3 For contributions authorized by section 12 of the Mutual
4 Security Act of 1952, \$6,666,667.

5 CORPORATION

6 The following corporation is hereby authorized to make
7 such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing
8 authority available to such corporation or agency and in
9 accord with law, and to make such contracts and commit-
10 ments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by
11 section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as
12 amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs
13 set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1953 for such
14 corporation:

15 Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

16 GENERAL PROVISIONS

17 Appropriations in this title for economic or technical
18 assistance and allocations from any appropriations to the
19 Director for Mutual Security, or the Mutual Security Agency,
20 or the Department of State, shall be available, without limi-
21 tation on any authority conferred by the Mutual Security
22 Act of 1951, as amended, or any Act continued in effect
23 thereby, for rents in the District of Columbia; expenses of
24 attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of such
25 appropriations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase

1 of not to exceed two aircraft for use outside the continental
2 limits of the United States and maintenance, operation, and
3 hire of aircraft; purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger
4 motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the
5 United States and, in addition, passenger motor vehicles
6 abroad may be exchanged or sold and replaced for an equal
7 number of such vehicles; transportation of privately owned
8 automobiles; entertainment within the United States (not to
9 exceed \$20,000) ; exchange of funds without regard to sec-
10 tion 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543) ; loss by
11 exchange; expenditures (not to exceed \$50,000) of a con-
12 fidential character other than entertainment provided that a
13 certificate of the amount of each such expenditure, the nature
14 of which it is considered inadvisable to specify, shall be made
15 by the Director or Deputy Director of Mutual Security, and
16 every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for
17 the amount therein specified; insurance of official motor ve-
18 hicles in foreign countries; acquisition of quarters
19 outside the continental limits of the United States to house
20 employees of the United States Government by rental (with-
21 out regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as
22 amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, purchase, or con-
23 struction, and necessary repairs and alterations to such
24 quarters; health and accident insurance for foreign
25 trainees and technicians while en route or absent from

1 their own countries participating in activities author-
2 ized under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;
3 actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former
4 homes in the United States or elsewhere the remains of per-
5 sons or members of the families of persons who may die
6 while such persons are away from their homes participating
7 in activities under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as
8 amended; and services of commissioned officers of the Public
9 Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for
10 the purposes of providing such services the Public Health
11 Service may appoint not to exceed 20 officers in the Regular
12 Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above
13 that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance with
14 section 711 of the Act of July 1, 1944, as amended (42
15 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey may
16 appoint for such purposes not to exceed 20 commissioned
17 officers in addition to those otherwise authorized: *Provided,*
18 That not to exceed \$37,800,000 shall be available
19 for administrative expenses of the departments and
20 agencies concerned with the administration of the programs
21 provided for herein and no part of such amount shall be used
22 to pay the salary of any civilian employee at a rate greater
23 than that paid by the State Department for comparable work
24 or services in the same area: *Provided further,* That no part
25 of such funds shall be expended for the purchase of Agricul-

1 tural products or products produced from Agricultural prod-
2 ucts not declared to be in short supply, in the United States
3 by the Secretary of Agriculture, at less than the prevailing
4 market price for such commodity within the United States
5 or if obtained from the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks,
6 at less than the support price of such commodity including
7 handling and storage costs.

8 No part of any appropriation made by this Chapter for
9 any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal services
10 in excess of an amount equal to 85 per centum of the amount
11 requested for personal services for such purpose in budget
12 estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal
13 year 1953; and the total amount of each appropriation, any
14 part of which is available for the payment of personal services
15 for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to
16 15 per centum of the amount requested in such budget
17 estimates for personal services for such purpose less an
18 amount representing the reduction, if any, between the
19 amount requested for personal services in the budget esti-
20 mates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

21 (b) This section shall not apply to—

22 (1) not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

23 (2) positions filled from within the Mutual Security
24 Agency and related government functions provided for
25 in this Act;

(3) offices or positions required by law to be filled
by appointment of the President by and with the advice
and consent of the Senate:

4 *Provided further*, That subsection (1) of paragraph (b)
5 shall operate to accomplish the provisions of paragraph (a),
6 and the said 85 per centum shall not be exceeded at any
7 time during fiscal year 1953: *And provided further*, That
8 each agency shall impound and deposit in the general fund
9 of the Treasury as soon as practicable, but not less frequently
10 than quarterly, an amount equivalent to the savings resulting
11 from the vacant positions which are prohibited from being
12 filled by this section, based on the salaries of the prior
13 incumbents of the positions.

14 This chapter may be cited as the “Mutual Security
15 Appropriation Act, 1953”.

CHAPTER X

EMERGENCY AGENCIES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

For expenses necessary for the Office of Defense Mobilization, including compensation of the Director of Defense Mobilization; printing and binding without regard to section 89 of the Act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U. S. C. 213); hire of passenger motor vehicles; reimburse-

1 ment of the General Services Administration for security
2 guard service; not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and
3 extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction
4 of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his
5 determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and
6 expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the pur-
7 poses of this appropriation; \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That
8 contracts under this appropriation for temporary or inter-
9 mittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
10 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), may be renewed annually.

11 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

12 DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION

13 For expenses necessary for the Defense Production Ad-
14 ministration, including employment of aliens, reimbursement
15 of General Services Administration for security guard serv-
16 ices, and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
17 the purposes of this appropriation, \$2,750,000: *Provided*,
18 That transfers (not to exceed 10 per centum) between the
19 appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Defense Production
20 Administration" and "Salaries and expenses, Defense Pro-
21 duction Activities, Department of Commerce" may be made
22 by agreement between the Secretary of Commerce and the
23 Administrator of the Defense Production Administration with
24 approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

1 DEFENSE TRANSPORT ADMINISTRATION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for the Defense Transport
4 Administration, including expenses of attendance at meet-
5 ings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation,
6 \$2,200,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be avail-
7 able for not to exceed four contracts for temporary or inter-
8 mittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
9 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), which may be renewed
10 annually.

11 SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For expenses necessary for the Small Defense Plants
14 Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings
15 concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, and pur-
16 chase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor
17 vehicles, \$3,500,000.

18 REVOLVING FUND

19 For the revolving fund authorized by paragraph (2) of
20 subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act
21 of 1950, as amended, \$3,000,000.

1 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

2 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

4 ACTIVITIES

5 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
6 enable the Federal Security Agency to carry out its functions
7 under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended,
8 including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
9 the purposes of this appropriation, \$400,000.

10 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

11 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

13 ACTIVITIES

14 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
15 Agriculture to carry out its functions under the Defense
16 Production Act of 1950, as amended, \$2,000,000.

17 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

18 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

20 ACTIVITIES

21 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
22 Commerce to carry out its functions under the Defense
23 Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of pas-

1 senger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; expenses of
2 attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this
3 appropriation; and reimbursement of General Services Ad-
4 ministration for security guard services; \$25,000,000.

5 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

6 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

8 ACTIVITIES

9 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
10 the Interior to carry out its functions under the Defense
11 Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of pas-
12 senger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; and expenses
13 of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of
14 this appropriation; \$2,500,000.

15 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

16 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

18 ACTIVITIES

19 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
20 Justice to carry out its functions under the Defense Pro-
21 duction Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of
22 attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this
23 appropriation, \$90,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

4 ACTIVITIES

5 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
6 Labor to carry out its functions under the Defense Produc-
7 tion Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attend-
8 ance at meetings concerned with the purpose of this appro-
9 priation, \$1,750,000.

10 ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For expenses necessary for the Economic Stabilization
13 Agency, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to
14 exceed \$5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses,
15 to be expended under the direction of the Administrator
16 for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination
17 thereon shall be final and conclusive; and expenses of attend-
18 ance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appro-
19 priation; including expenses of liquidation of those agencies
20 whose operations and functions will expire prior to June
21 30, 1953; \$57,130,000: *Provided*, That of this amount
22 \$11,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Rent Stabili-
23 zation of which \$2,000,000 shall be placed in reserve under

1 the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as
2 amended, to be released by the Director of the Budget only
3 on his determination that the workload of the agency so
4 requires.

5 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

6 For an additional amount for "Emergency operating
7 expenses", \$5,000,000; and appropriations granted under
8 this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available only to
9 enable the General Services Administration to carry out
10 its functions arising out of the Defense Production Act of
11 1950, as amended.

12 FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

13 OPERATIONS

14 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in
15 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense
16 Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress), including
17 purchase (not to exceed eight) and hire of passenger motor
18 vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
19 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the
20 Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of em-
21 ployees occupying positions of critical importance from the
22 standpoint of national security; expenses of attendance at
23 meetings concerned with civil defense functions; reimburse-
24 ment of the General Services Administration for security
25 guard services; not to exceed \$9,000 for the purchase

1 of newspapers, periodicals, and teletype news services; and
2 not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary ex-
3 penses to be expended under the direction of the Administra-
4 tor for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determina-
5 tion thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$8,000,000.

6 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

7 For financial contributions to the States, not otherwise
8 provided for, pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the
9 Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, to be equally matched
10 with State funds, \$29,500,000.

11 PROCUREMENT FUND

12 The "Civil Defense Procurement Fund" is continued
13 available without fiscal year limitation.

14 CHAPTER XI

15 CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

16 For payment of claims for damages as settled and
17 determined by departments and agencies in accord with
18 law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Ac-
19 counting Office, and judgments rendered against the United
20 States by United States district courts and the United States
21 Court of Claims, as set forth in House Document Num-
22 bered 517, and Senate Document Numbered 144, Eighty-
23 second Congress, \$6,489,954, together with such amounts
24 as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when
25 specified in such judgments or in certain of the settle-

1 ments of the General Accounting Office or provided
2 by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates
3 of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign
4 currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated
5 for shall be paid until it shall have become final and con-
6 clusive against the United States by failure of the parties
7 to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless
8 otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment,
9 payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall
10 not continue for more than thirty days after the date of
11 approval of this Act.

12 CHAPTER XII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

13 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

14 SEC. 1201. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the
15 maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year,
16 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946
17 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor
18 vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station
19 wagons), is hereby fixed at \$1,400, notwithstanding the
20 provisions of Section 405 of the Independent Offices Appro-
21 priation Act, 1953.

22 SEC. 1202. Unless otherwise specified and during the
23 current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained
24 in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensa-
25 tion of any officer or employee of the Government of the

1 United States (including any agency the majority of the
2 stock of which is owned by the Government of the United
3 States) whose post of duty is in continental United States
4 unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States,
5 (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the
6 date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizen-
7 ship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen
8 of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person
9 who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided*, That
10 for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such
11 person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the
12 requirements of this section with respect to his status have
13 been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person
14 making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon
15 conviction, shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned
16 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That
17 the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in
18 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
19 *vided further*, That any payment made to any officer or
20 employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be
21 recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This
22 section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the
23 Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the
24 United States in the current defense effort.

25 SEC. 1203. Appropriations of the executive departments

1 and independent establishments for the current fiscal year,
2 available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the
3 activity concerned, are hereby made available for living
4 quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26,
5 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed there-
6 under, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed
7 under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946,
8 in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regula-
9 tions of the President, for all civilian officers and employees
10 of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-
11 tries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made
12 to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions
13 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected
14 hereby.

15 SEC. 1204. No part of any appropriation for the cur-
16 rent fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be
17 paid to any person for the filling of any position for which
18 he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted
19 not to approve the nomination of said person.

20 SEC. 1205. No part of any appropriation contained in
21 this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of \$4
22 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United
23 States Code Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased
24 on condition and with the understanding that latest pub-
25 lished cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the

1 date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in
2 excess of \$4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes
3 of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

4 SEC. 1206. Funds made available by this or any other
5 Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of
6 the corporations and agencies subject to the Government
7 Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841),
8 shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds
9 are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia;
10 examination of budgets and estimates of appropriations in
11 the field; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act
12 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and the objects specified
13 under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable
14 to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in
15 the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That
16 in the event any functions budgeted as administrative ex-
17 penses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other
18 funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be
19 correspondingly reduced.

20 SEC. 1207. No part of any funds of or available to any
21 wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for
22 the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the
23 purchase or construction of any office building at the seat
24 of government primarily for occupancy by any department

1 or agency of the United States Government or by any cor-
2 poration owned by the United States Government.

3 SEC. 1208. No part of any appropriation contained in
4 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
5 corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the
6 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike
7 against the Government of the United States or who is a
8 member of an organization of Government employees that
9 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
10 United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an or-
11 ganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
12 of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for
13 the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima
14 facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not
15 contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike
16 against the Government of the United States, is not a member
17 of an organization of Government employees that asserts the
18 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
19 or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
20 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
21 Government of the United States by force or violence: *Pro-*
22 *vided further*, That any person who engages in a strike
23 against the Government of the United States or who is a
24 member of an organization of Government employees that
25 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the

1 United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an
2 organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Govern-
3 ment of the United States by force or violence and accepts
4 employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any
5 appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall
6 be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not
7 more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year,
8 or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause
9 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
10 provisions of existing law.

11 SEC. 1209. No payment shall be made from appropri-
12 ations in this Act or any other to any officer on the retired
13 lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine
14 Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and
15 Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period
16 of two years after retirement who for himself or for others
17 is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of
18 or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Depart-
19 ment of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic
20 Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war
21 materials.

22 SEC. 1210. Appropriations and funds made available by
23 this or any other Act for salaries, wages, or compensation
24 shall also be available for payment of any tax with respect
25 thereto which is imposed on any department, agency, cor-

1 poration, or other instrumentality of the United States, as an
2 employer, by the provisions of the Social Security Act
3 Amendments of 1950.

4 SEC. 1211. During the current fiscal year, personnel
5 and appropriations or funds available for salaries and ex-
6 penses to any department, agency, or corporation in the
7 executive branch of the Government, shall be transferred to
8 any defense activity under the jurisdiction of such depart-
9 ment or agency in such numbers or amounts as may be
10 necessary for the discharge of responsibilities relating to
11 the national defense assigned to such department, agency,
12 or corporation by or pursuant to law.

13 SEC. 1212. None of the funds provided by this Act shall
14 be used to pay employees at a rate in excess of that paid for
15 comparable work under the regular appropriations provided
16 to the departments and agencies concerned in the regular
17 1953 appropriation Acts.

18 SEC. 1213. During the current fiscal year, the provisions
19 of Bureau of the Budget Circular A-45, dated June 3, 1952,
20 shall be controlling over the activities of all departments,
21 agencies, and corporations of the Government: *Provided*,
22 That said circular may be amended or changed during such
23 year by the Director of the Budget with the approval of the
24 chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House
25 of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of the

1 Budget shall make a report to Congress not later than Janu-
2 ary 31, 1953, of the operations of this order upon all depart-
3 ments, agencies, and corporations of the Government: *Pro-*
4 *vided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any
5 other law no officer or employee shall be required to occupy
6 any Government-owned quarters unless the head of the agency
7 concerned shall determine that necessary service cannot be
8 rendered or property of the United States cannot be ade-
9 quately protected otherwise.

10 SEC. 1214. The appropriations, authorizations, and
11 authority with respect thereto in this Act or any regular
12 annual appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 which
13 has not been enacted into law prior to July 1, 1952, shall
14 be available from and including such date for the purposes
15 respectively provided in such appropriations, authorizations,
16 and authority. All obligations incurred during the period
17 between June 30, 1952, and the date of enactment of
18 this Act or the applicable Act in anticipation of such ap-
19 propriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified
20 and confirmed if in accordance with the respective terms
21 thereof.

22 SEC. 1215. Foreign credits owed to or owned by the
23 United States Treasury will not be available for expendi-
24 ture by agencies of the United States after June 30, 1953,
25 except as may be provided for annually in appropriation

1 Acts and provisions for the utilization of such credits for
2 purposes authorized by law are hereby authorized to be
3 included in general appropriation Acts.

4 SEC. 1216. This Act may be cited as the "Supplemental
5 Appropriation Act, 1953".

Passed the House of Representatives June 27, 1952.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for
other purposes.

JUNE 30 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1952

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

15. CROP ESTIMATES. The Abernethy Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee has submitted a report analyzing and making recommendations regarding the crop estimating and reporting services of this Department, with particular reference to the cotton crop estimates last year. The report has been released as a "committee print" and is not available for regular distribution. A small supply, however, has been made available to Mr. Newell's office, BAE.

SENATE

16. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 7391, Defense Department appropriation bill for 1953. Senate conferees were appointed. (pp. 8722-87.)
Received from the President additional supplemental appropriation estimates for claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments; to Appropriations Committee (S. Doc. 154) (p. 8716).
17. NOMINATIONS. Received the nominations of Joel D. Wolfschlag and Robert H. McKinney to be Assistant Secretaries of the Interior (p. 8789).
18. PRICE MAINTENANCE. Made its unfinished business H. R. 5767, to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to extend the provisions of State "fair-trade" laws relating to minimum or stipulated resale prices to merchants not signing such agreements with wholesalers or distributors (pp. 8788-9).
19. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Sen. Wiley inserted Wisconsin Bankers' Association and Green Bay, Wis. taxpayers' groups resolutions requesting tax reductions and reduced Federal expenditures (p. 8716).

BILLS INTRODUCED

20. HOUSING; LOANS. H. R. 8431, by Rep. Javits, to authorize a program of expanded housing research, loans, and other financial aids to assist in the provision of housing for families of moderate income; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 8713).
21. PERSONNEL. H. R. 8432, by Rep. Wier, to authorize the heads of the executive departments and the agencies and independent establishments of the Federal Government to provide for the promotion and maintenance of employee recreation programs; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 8713).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

22. EXPENDITURES. Sen. O'Connor inserted a council of State chambers of commerce nine-point platform for better Federal Government and reduced expenditures (pp. A4323-4).
23. IMMIGRATION. Rep. Rodino inserted his statement before the House Judiciary Committee in favor of H. R. 7376, permitting 300,000 non-quota immigration visas to certain refugees (p. A4326).
24. PRICE CONTROLS. Speeches by Reps. Buckley and Shelley opposing House amendments to the Defense Production Act, Rep. Shelley claiming that it was an "almost incredible disregard for the national stability" apparently to "straitjacket labor and the consumer and to give a clear field to business and agricultural interests for making hay" (pp. A4356-57).

Speech by Rep. Whitten discussing his amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill, 1953, making provision for the Economic Stabilization Agency (p. A4330).

25. PRICE MAINTENANCE. Speech by Rep. Rogers in favor of H. R. 5767, making state minimum resale price laws effective in interstate commerce (p. A4331).
26. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Rep. Rogers inserted a number of telegrams from colleges urging passage of the Senate version of H. R. 7656, the Korean GI bill, which would establish separate subsistence and tuition payments to veterans (p. A4345).
27. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Miller inserted a magazine article and a resolution favoring the Capehart-Miller bill providing for the further development of hydroelectric power from the Niagara Falls and River by private enterprise; and a newspaper editorial criticizing the President for his attack against private power (pp. A4349-50, A4351-2, A4364-5).
- Extension of remarks by Rep. Mitchell defending the public power development program in the Pacific Northwest from attacks by private electric utilities, and inserting a report by the Bonneville Power Administration on this subject (pp. A4352-3).
28. PERSONNEL RETIREMENT. Sen. O'Connor inserted a Washington Post article recognizing the service of various Federal employees retiring from the government, including John W. Kinghorne, Assistant Director of the Poultry Branch of IMA (p. A4350).
29. RECLAMATION. Rep. Jackson inserted a California Farm Journal article discussing the fight between the Bureau of Reclamation and California for control of irrigation waters in the Central Valley (p. A4351).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS RELEASED BY GPO

30. APPROPRIATIONS. Legislative Appropriations, 1953, H. R. 7313. S. Appropriations Committee.
- Departments of State, Justice, Commerce and the Judiciary Appropriations for 1953, H. R. 7289. S. Appropriations Committee.

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

31. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. S. 2594, to amend and extend the Defense Production Act. Approved June 30, 1952.

oOo

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS for July 1: Supplemental appropriations, S. Appropriations (ex). Conference on Korean GI bill (ex); Interior appropriations (ex); and D. C. appropriations (ex).

oOo

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654, or send to Room 105A.

- oOo -

in this regard which I will relate to you in a few moments.

We shun the words "conservation," "social security," "social progress," "collective bargaining," and "civil rights" as though they are tainted although they are of respectable origin and have long been heralded as guiding principles of the Republican Party.

But the question is whether we can shun them until convention time and then make them a battle cry after convention? I wonder what will be said about them this time in the platform.

I wonder if we will repeat our promises of former years, or if we will turn our backs on social progress as many would have us do. One thing we should do above all others—we should tell the truth. We should not put one thing in the platform and then condemn it in performance.

The Republican Party has never had a left wing, for which we can be duly thankful. But we do have a withering right wing that would, if it could, turn the clock back in emulation of what it nostalgically calls "the good old days." The old days, for good or ill, are dead and gone. We must live in the present. We must look forward to the future. No longer can we live in isolated splendor. We must live in the world. No longer can any segment of society or of our economy be the darling, the whipping boy, or the abandoned child of any party of the people. All must have the opportunity for a place in the sun.

No longer can any region of our country be treated as a distant cousin. Each must have an opportunity to develop the limit of its potential. Our country, in order to develop its true strength, must be an integrated whole. It is a Nation of 155,000,000 people, each with his hopes and ambitions, and each entitled to an opportunity to try to achieve them.

I do not advocate making these things possible by any new philosophy of government, by any new approaches. I want to see them accomplished through good old-fashioned Republican principles as solemnly declared by Republican National Conventions in their platforms.

I wonder how many of you have recently read the platforms of 1944 and 1948. They are good reading. They are inspiring. I commend them to you. The question is: Are we to abide by them? The reason I ask this question is that so many people consider the things done for them by Government as social progress, and what is done for others as socialism. They represent that kind of thinking which Lincoln said cannot distinguish between a horse chestnut and a chestnut horse. I read an editorial a few days ago in one of our fine newspapers of the West that struck me as significant. It typifies this kind of thinking. (Read editorial from Sacramento Bee.)

On the same day I also read an article in one of our national magazines bearing upon an important phase of our national life. It is not long and I will read it. (Read article from Newsweek.)

Does this not point up problems of the people—health, education, social conditions? I had a third one bearing on the lack of employment opportunity for people of certain racial origin. I have misplaced it, but it too points out one of the great inequalities of our national life.

Now, all of these problems are adequately covered in our platform. But if one follows those platforms he is roundly condemned by a segment of both parties. We can't do it as a political party and win. We can't do it as a Republic and succeed.

Unfortunately, the public does not always understand the issue because an oblique approach is too often made against any effort to remedy conditions. If an effort is made to do so nationally in accordance with the

party platform, it is argued that it is a matter for the States, and when initiated by the States, that it is a matter for the Federal Government.

I am not pessimistic. My party is not the only one beset by these difficulties. Both parties have them. My point is, I don't want the Republican Party to succumb to them. I want it to face squarely every problem of American life. I want it to be unashamed to admit each problem and work for its solution. I want people in every walk of life to believe the Republican Party is interested in their welfare. I believe we can best accomplish that result by keeping in mind before and during the convention what our problem is to be afterward.

Ancient Order of Hibernians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1952

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose a copy of the resolutions of the last biennial State convention of the Massachusetts Ancient Order of Hibernians in America at Boston, Mass., June 7-8, 1952:

Resolved, That we the delegates to the biennial State convention of the Massachusetts Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, assembled in Boston, Mass., June 7-8, 1952, do hereby propose for adoption the following resolutions:

I. *Resolved*, That we again renew our spiritual allegiance to His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, the vicar of Christ on earth, reaffirming our loyalty to our sovereign pontiff in a troubled world; and we pledge our support to our Holy Father in his untiring efforts to bring about a lasting peace based on justice and mercy among nations of the world; and we pray Almighty God to shower His choicest blessings on His Holiness to give him health and strength to carry on the arduous duties of his sacred office for many years to come.

II. *Resolved*, That we again profess our sincere loyalty to the United States and all the constituted authorities founded thereon, to show the undying love we have for the land that welcomed our forefathers years ago, which love is shown by the resplendent records of accomplishments by the Irish on the field of battle and in their daily lives; and we pledge our Hibernian efforts to the task of defending the United States against atheistic communism and all other totalitarian movements of aggression.

III. *Resolved*, That we express our sincere thanks to our beloved national chaplain, His Excellency, Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D., for his many public pronouncements made in defense of the church against communism, injustice, and aggression everywhere; and we commend him for the continued promotion of the daily recitation of the family rosary over the radio networks.

IV. *Resolved*, That we deeply deplore the ever-mounting evils of divorce, birth control, planned parenthood, the lack of parental responsibility in the home, the failure to properly train children in the love of God, which have resulted in the broken homes and the juvenile delinquency of this generation, and we hereby rededicate ourselves to the sanctity and integrity of the Christian family home.

V. *Resolved*, That we hereby denounce those programs on television which tend to

corrupt the morals of our youth by indecency in dress, speech, and actions, and we charge our brother members to be ever on the alert to bring any such transgressions of decency to the attention of the sponsors of the programs; and further we condemn the prevalence of the uncensored so-called comics and obscene literature.

VI. *Resolved*, That we go on record as being opposed to any cutting down of the services of the Veterans' Administration and the elimination of the Veterans' Administration Medical and Surgical Department that would thus deprive our brother veterans of the services to which they are entitled.

VII. *Resolved*, That we sympathize with the many nations of Europe and Asia behind the iron curtain who have been forced to yield their right of self-determination to the ruthless power of Soviet Russia.

VIII. *Resolved*, That we hereby denounce and condemn communism as the greatest threat to our church, our country, and our race.

IX. *Resolved*, That in view of present conditions we again condemn all bigoted and un-American attempts to deprive children attending parochial, religious, and private schools of the advantages conferred upon children attending public schools through the use of bus transportation, lunch subsidies, and other health and welfare facilities provided by public funds.

X. *Resolved*, That we reaffirm and support anew the efforts of our honored order and the liberal members of the Massachusetts general court in seeking to establish the 17th of March, St. Patrick's Day, and the anniversary of the evacuation of the British from Boston in 1776, as a State holiday.

XI. *Resolved*, That we go on record as favoring the elevation of the office of Irish consul in Boston to the status of consul general because of the large number of people of Irish blood in New England who have manifested their great interest in the needs and problems of Ireland.

XII. *Resolved*, That because the essence of democracy is the inherent and God-given right of a people to determine freely the manner in which they are to be governed, and because the authority for this self-determination is vested in the nation itself, and because partition, although steadfastly opposed, was imposed over the vigorous protests of an overwhelming majority of the Irish people; we hereby denounce the English Government for the unjust dismemberment of Ireland, which by its setting up, subsidizing and supporting has engendered hatred among the people of the different religious beliefs of that area and we accuse the so-called government of Northern Ireland as a ruthless and bigoted despotism because it deprives the nationalist population of every right enjoyed by free peoples.

XIII. *Resolved*, That we hereby rededicate ourselves to the cause of ending the artificial and unjust partition of Ireland to the end that Ireland may regain her ancient position among the nations of the world, a complete and independent Republic of Ireland, one and indivisible.

XIV. *Resolved*, That we hereby protest and condemn any disbursements of American taxpayer's moneys as gifts, credits, or benefits to the English Government so long as it continues to exercise its tyrannical control over the six northern counties of Ireland.

XV. *Resolved*, That we instruct our secretary to communicate our best wishes and congratulations to Sean O'Kelly on his unanimous reelection as President of the Irish Republic.

XVI. *Resolved*, That we again renew our devotion to the principles of our order—friendship, unity, and Christian charity—and our loyalty to the constitution and by laws, and rededicate ourselves to promoting

the best interests of the Massachusetts Ancient Order of Hibernians in America. Respectfully submitted.

P. Frank Kean, National Treasurer, Chairman; Rev. Michael J. Houlihan, State Chaplain; Rev. Florence J. Donohue, Hampden County Chaplain; Paul E. Tierney, National Director; Jeremiah E. O'Neill, Bristol County; Dennis J. Lynch, Hampden County; Thomas H. Buckley, Middlesex County; Michael Cunnane, Plymouth County; Mark L. Morrison, Suffolk County; Edward P. Healy, Worcester County, Resolutions Committee.

This is to certify that the Massachusetts Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, in convention assembled at Boston, Mass., on June 8, 1952, unanimously accepted the above resolutions and ordered them included in the minutes of the convention.

THOMAS C. PHILLIPS,
State Secretary.

Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952

SPEECH
OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1952

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8210) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendments to the Defense Production Act offered here today since they would, in effect, remove controls or weaken them to such extent that they would no longer be effective. I find it necessary to vote against final passage of the bill since I cannot conscientiously give my support to a program designed to undermine the Nation's economy. I am deeply shocked at the action of the House in permitting the price control law to be amended and revised in such manner that it cannot possibly be anything but a control law in name only. In reality, the amendments adopted here today offer a green light signal to the profiteers to impose financial burdens upon the American people who are looking to us to protect them from further increases in the cost of living.

The issue being fought here today is an old one. Carrying the ball for the removal of price controls are those special interests who stand to profit most from high prices. Aligned against the special interests are the farmers, wage and salary earners, and housewives, the consumers of the Nation.

The votes cast here today will reveal which side we are on. And I warn the Members of the House that the action taken on this bill will not soon be forgotten by the American public.

The Defense Production Act has had my support consistently. With controls in force we have barely been able to hold the line of the cost of living. I believe, most emphatically, that if we remove all

price controls the flame of inflation will burn higher and higher. That portion of our population who live on annuities and pensions will be faced with disaster. Lower and middle income groups will be forced to a lower standard of living. This bill now before us is but a feeble gesture to extend the present law. It is so badly mangled that if it becomes law it will carry little meaning.

The people of this country look to Congress for protection against spiraling living costs. We cannot let them down. I vote against this bill in protest against its inequities.

Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1953

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 28, 1952

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to make provision for the Economic Stabilization Agency, its constituent office, and the General Services Administration. This is offered as a committee amendment. It is brought up in this form because at the time the bill was being considered by the committee final action had not been taken on the authorizing legislation.

The recommendations are based on the conference report on the Defense Production Act, which is subject to approval by the House and the Senate.

The amount of \$57,130,000 recommended by the committee for ESA represents a reduction of \$46,120,000 in the budget estimates of \$103,250,000. The allocations to specific activities are as follows:

Office of Price Stabilization.....	\$36,500,000
Office of Rent Stabilization.....	11,000,000
Wage Stabilization Board.....	7,500,000
Salary Stabilization Board.....	1,700,000
Railroad and Airline Wage Board	80,000
Office of Administrator.....	350,000
Total.....	57,130,000

In achieving the reduction of \$46,120,000 the committee believes that it has placed these agencies on a realistic operating basis. That this has not been true in the past, particularly in the Office of Price Stabilization, is borne out by testimony received in the hearings on this estimate. The OPS portion of these hearings was chiefly based on a study made by the investigative staff of the committee which disclosed gross overstaffing in the regional and district offices of OPS. The committee is therefore directing that at least \$25,000,000 of the reduction of \$31,920,000 achieved

in the OPS estimates be applied to the operation of the field offices. This is a reduction of approximately 50 percent in the request for this particular operation.

It would appear that reductions in the workload of the Office of Rent Stabilization will be achieved by the recommendation in the conference report on the Defense Production Act. The extent of these reductions cannot be forecast, especially those which will occur as a result of the rent decontrol provision therein. The committee does not believe it can recommend funds on the basis of a workload that might not materialize. Accordingly, the language of the amendment contains a provision placing \$2,000,000 of the amount recommended for this office in reserve until such time as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget finds that the workload of the agency justifies its release.

Testimony before the committee disclosed that both the Wage and Salary Stabilization Boards have prepared the basic regulations to control their particular fields of endeavor. The effectiveness of these regulations is borne out by testimony of the Wage Stabilization Board which disclosed that it has approved 86 percent of the petitions for increases it has received. The remaining 14 percent have been either modified or rejected. It would appear that a sizable reduction could be made in the workload of WSB if the proper means are devised for handling the 86 percent of the petitions that are being approved.

In effecting the reductions of \$46,120,000 the committee will expect the Administrator to maintain an average grade and salary in each office or board of ESA which is in line with proper classification standards and certainly no higher than those prevailing in fiscal year 1952.

Under the aforementioned conference report authority for the functions of several of these offices will expire prior to the end of fiscal year 1953. The committee has therefore included funds within the recommended amounts for the entire liquidation costs of the agencies so affected.

The reduction of \$3,500,000 in the \$8,500,000 requested by the General Services Administration is generally based on the personal reduction achieved by the committee in the defense agencies. Certainly the amount of space for emergency agencies will be a great deal less than that used as a basis for the major portion of the funds requested by GSA. The committee will also expect this agency to achieve savings in 1953 by a greater use of its regular personnel and services in defense work than is anticipated by the budget estimates.

I view of the fact that this item is being handled as a committee amendment from the floor my remarks as the spokesman for the committee are to be accepted by the agencies in lieu of the usual report.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As one of the minority members of the subcommittee that had charge of the emergency agency budget

request, I state that we in the minority are in agreement with the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. We should point out to the House what the agencies originally requested for the coming year, that are included in this amendment. The Bureau of the Budget submitted a figure of \$103,250,000. This amendment provides \$57,130,000; in other words the committee has reduced the budget request almost 50 percent.

Minimum Resale Prices

SPEECH
OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1952

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum resale prices and which are extended by State law to nonsigners.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill. I wish every one of you had had the time to read the hearings. This is a simple bill, and it merely does this: It is the enabling act, which enables the State to do business across State lines. Remember that. In its simplicity, it just permits a State to do business with an adjoining State, if they have similar laws. In other words, if New York and Pennsylvania have similar laws concerning fair trade, this bill permits business to extend across the State line and permits the contracts made in compliance with the laws of those two States to be enforced in interstate commerce. That is all it does.

In order to get to the merits of any legislation, we have to know the present conditions. We have to know the relief that we want to bring about to correct the evil that exists. In 1931, the State of California passed the first fair-trade act. Since that time, 45 States have passed fair-trade acts. This is even more binding than a constitutional amendment. I would like to ask each Member of the House this question. Suppose you had a constitutional amendment which was consented to and approved by 36 States, which is all that is necessary to adopt an amendment to the Constitution? Do you not think you would be bound by it? That is the way we amend the Constitution. Now, here are 45 States that have passed fair-trade laws. The laws are on the statute books of these 45 States. Only three States, Missouri, Texas, Vermont, and the District of Columbia, do not have such laws. All of the 45 States have fair-trade laws. Do you think it is fair, do you think it is honest, do you think it is equitable for the Congress to say

to these 45 States that they cannot have fair-trade laws, to say "We are not going to let you have fair-trade laws although you are entitled to govern your internal affairs so far as fair-trade laws and acts are concerned, but that we, the Congress, who have the authority to pass the laws in interstate commerce, are going to say that you cannot have that"?

Are we going to say that we are going to take that right away from them, and put them in a position where these cut-throat prices can exist and disturb the economy of this Nation? This bill is intended to avoid that. I, as a Member of this Congress, think that I ought to give some consideration to what these States want. I am one of the Members of Congress who believes in States rights. I think the States ought to have something to do with legislation that is passed by these States.

I do not think in a case like this, this Congress should come in and say to the States that "Although your legislature passed such law, we are going to cut you down. We are going to take the right away from the 45 States."

Is that fair? Do you think that is your duty. I think the Fair Trade Act is meritorious. We ought to look into whether the States have the right. Let us see what the history of this is and why this legislation is necessary.

In 1937 the Miller-Tydings Act was passed. All the States have been operating under the Miller-Tydings Act until 1951.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. In 1936 the United States Supreme Court in a unanimous decision upheld the constitutionality of each of these State fair trade acts. That is constitutional. The following year the Miller-Tydings Act was passed by this Congress to give full effect to the State fair-trade laws by permitting the operation of fair trade in interstate commerce. As I say, we continued to operate very peacefully until 1951 from 1937. Everything was done by the States which this act today will enable them to continue to do.

In 1951 the Supreme Court weakened the fair-trade structure, so laboriously built up by the States, by holding that the retailer who did not sign a fair-trade contract could not be required to respect fair-trade prices where interstate commerce was involved.

As I say, this is a simple bill, and I see no reason why the 45 States of this Union desiring to proceed under a Fair Trade Act, why this Congress should come in and try to take that right away from them.

The McGuire bill merely places Congress on record that Congress means to have State fair-trade laws apply in their entirety. That means the so-called nonsigner clauses, as well as the rest of the State fair-trade laws, could be enforced with respect to interstate commerce.

Now, what is a so-called nonsigner clause? A nonsigner clause is a provision in a State fair-trade law which provides that any merchant who had knowl-

edge of the fact that the resale price of a certain toothpaste, for example, is fixed at 39 cents, may not sell such toothpaste at less than 39 cents, even if such merchant failed to sign any agreement to that effect with the manufacturer of the toothpaste. If the merchant feels that under these circumstances he prefers not to carry this particular brand of toothpaste, he is free to carry other brands which are not fair traded. That is up to him.

The constitutionality of these so-called nonsigner clauses has been specifically upheld by the Supreme Court. Therefore, there is no question of the constitutionality of the bill in legalizing the application of nonsigner clauses with respect to interstate transactions.

The hearings before our committee showed that there is considerable controversy with respect to the economic merits of permitting the application of the nonsigner clauses to interstate commerce. A great number of trade associations representing a large segment of American retailers and wholesalers favored the enactment of the McGuire bill. Likewise, several prominent manufacturers have supported this measure before the committee.

The committee felt, after long hearings—and I wish every Member of this House could read them—the committee felt that the 45 States which have seen fit to enact these laws have a right to insist that their laws may be applied and enforced, regardless of the fact that some of the merchandise covered by these laws may have crossed State lines. That is all this means. That is the only thing it is applicable to.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to congratulate the gentleman, my colleague, on his statements about States' rights. I am wondering if my colleague has given any consideration to the rights of the consuming public and whether or not it is his opinion that the consumers and buyers of the Nation will pay more or less under this bill which is labeled a fair-trade law.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Answering the gentleman, may I say that I always want to give consideration to the consumer but I want to say that first and foremost we should give consideration to the laws passed by the States. If representatives of the various legislatures pass bills of this type for their States and fortify it, then a small minority of the people should not come down here and want to repeal such legislation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will ask the gentleman to answer the question whether he believes under this legislation the consuming public will pay more or less for the products they buy.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. On the general average about the same. But going back to the fair treatment of distributors of the products of America, thousands and thousands of little independent merchants and druggists will be taken care of, under the provisions of the fair-trade laws.

That We May Continue To Enjoy Freedom Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 30, 1952

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the most American of our holidays, it is well for us to think of the true import of July 4. It is our day of independence, our day to rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom. The freedom which we cherish is not merely license; but it is freedom under God's discipline. Only as we live under such discipline will it be possible for us to gain, secure, and retain true freedom. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include the following splendid editorial from the June 29 edition of the *Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union*:

THAT WE MAY CONTINUE TO ENJOY FREEDOM UNDER GOD

This being the week of the Fourth of July, people in the United States will hear a great deal about the need for preserving their traditional way of life.

The occasion for this kind of talk will be the gradual movement of our Government toward the social welfare state, a trend this is believed to be robbing the American people of their freedoms.

Not a word that is spoken in this vein will be superfluous. Governmental regimentation of business and paternalism in the administration of our national affairs demand that the American people concern themselves about these encroachments upon their liberties.

At the same time, it might also be well for Americans to pause and think upon another theme that is being injected into the Independence Week observance by Governor Fine of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvanians are being asked by their Governor to stress a "freedom under God" observance during the period June 27-July 4. "Spiritual emphasis," he declares, "is essential to a revival of the original spirit of Independence Day."

The freedom that we enjoy "under God" in the United States is the distinguishing feature of our national existence. It is this essential quality that differentiates our way of life from that which is led by people who live under the dictatorship of Soviet totalitarianism.

In Russia, the individual is considered a pawn of the state. He is a subject of a governmental philosophy that makes a God-head of the state. The American way of life gives dignity to the human soul.

The "In God We Trust" philosophy of government in the United States is predicated on one of the basic freedoms which some day may be denied to the American people if they do not remain on guard to preserve their national heritage. The right to worship a Divine power, as we understand him, is inherent in the design and purpose of the American Government.

The Governor of Pennsylvania is making a timely plea in asking the people of his State to appreciate more fully the value of the spiritual strength upon which our national existence rests. It will take something like this to help withstand the onslaughts of the Godless ideology, the philosophy of dialectic materialism, that is threatening to engulf the world. It will take people consecrated to the principle of "freedom under God" to save the American

way of life from the fanatical and purposeful few who are dedicated to the religion of communism.

"Freedom under God" means the privilege to worship according to the dictates of our own conscience. It is a theme in keeping with the spirit which gave the God-fearing founders of our Republic the strength to fight, bleed, and die for the things which they held dear.

The Federal Grand Jury: Its Powers and Duties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 18, 1952

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD* an outstanding address entitled "The Federal Grand Jury: Its Powers and Duties," delivered by the Honorable Anthony W. Fitzgerald, counsel of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the Eastern District of New York, at the monthly meeting of the association on November 26, 1951.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the address is estimated to make approximately three and one-third pages of the *RECORD*, at a cost of \$280.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

May I also mention, by way of preliminary remarks, that anything I may say tonight should not—indeed, must not—be construed as an attack, direct or by implication, on any United States attorney or district attorney, now or in the recent past in office in this area. Men of the caliber of Frank Hogan, Miles McDonald, Frank Parker, Irving Saypol, Myles Lane need no endorsement from me. They are all outstanding men in their jobs, with splendid and enviable records in public office, and it would be impossible for anyone to slander public officials of their character.

The grand jury (or grande inquest, as it is termed anciently in England) has been termed "the last stronghold of initiative by the layman in criminal law, for regardless of the wishes of the district attorney or of the judge, the grand jury, on its own motion, can take steps against criminals and misconduct by public officials." Those words were spoken by one of the greatest prosecutors we have ever had in the city of New York—our own Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

A Federal district court judge in *Hoffman v. United States* remarked as recently as last July: "The most valuable function of the grand jury has been not only to examine into the commission of crimes but also to stand between the prosecutor and the accused."

To me, gentlemen, the powers and duties of the grand jury—and the kernel of any remarks I make here tonight—are thrillingly set forth in the very wording of the oath you—and I—took on that impressive occasion when we first became grand jurors. (I will cite the foreman's oath):

"You as foreman of this inquest for the body of the eastern district of New York do solemnly swear that you shall diligently

inquire and true presentment make of all such matters and things as shall be given you in charge. The Government's counsel, your fellows' and, your own you shall keep secret. You shall present no one for envy, hatred, or malice; nor shall you leave anyone unpresented through fear, favor, affection, hope of reward or gain. But you shall present all things truly as they come to your knowledge, according to the best of your understanding. So help you God."

Those stirring words, gentlemen, have come down to us generation after generation from the earliest days of the grande inquest; they express better than any halting words of mine the powers and the obligations each one of you had as grand jurors.

"The grand jury is a rubber stamp of the district attorney; it is putty in his hands." Many of you will recognize therein words uttered by a former mayor of this great city of ours.

"The grand jury is cumbersome, costly, easily replaceable with the 'information'." The information, you know, is a device by which an official signs a complaint, under oath, that X has committed a certain crime.

The first point to consider is that of statistics. Now, I don't have to tell you, in the light of the Gallup poll, how careful one has to be with using mere numbers. They can be twisted to mean almost anything. But I believe you will be impressed, if not startled, when I tell you that our grand jury indictment system is used only in the Federal courts and in 22 out of the 48 States. Morse in the *Oregon Law Review* made a study of the grand jury some years ago, and discovered that 19 States, among them some which lawyers regard as "busy" States—California, Missouri, Nebraska, Washington—have the "alternative method," this is, either the indictment (grand jury) procedure or the information is used, with a noticeable tendency to let the grand jury idea slide into disuse—"innocuous desuetude" I have seen it called—and final death.

The second argument for abolishing the grand jury might find support in a fairly recent rule (7b) in our own Federal courts. Under that rule, a defendant may waive his rights in any criminal case except a capital one, and be prosecuted on information. That means that the vast bulk of cases you hear in the grand jury room—robbing of post boxes, violations of narcotics laws—could be removed from your consideration and the grand jury would be called in only in cases where the penalty is death.

A third argument could be drawn from opinions expressed by Federal judges themselves. Not all are in favor of the grand jury. Some months ago a Federal district court judge scolded a grand jury in San Francisco and told them flatly they were not an investigative body and could take up only cases presented to them by the United States attorney. Of course, that judge could not have been more wrong. You may think me extremely presumptuous to stand here and pass a remark such as that—but when I finish tonight, I think you will agree with me that that judge ought to review his grand jury law too.

Lastly and to me most compelling and dangerous of all is the argument that the motherland of the grand jury, the seat and origin of much of our law, has herself abolished the grand jury as costly and useless as recently as 1933; I refer of course, to England.

It is for you grand jurors tonight to weigh the evidence I present to you in favor of the grand jury system; you will decide whether we should keep this priceless heritage or not.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

JULY 2 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1952.—Reported under authority of the order of the Senate and ordered to be printed

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8370]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed House-----	\$10, 127, 840, 780
Amount of decrease by Senate committee-----	—1, 893, 254, 494
Amount of bill as reported to Senate-----	8, 234, 586, 286
Total estimates considered by the Senate-----	13, 867, 928, 689
Amount of decrease recommended by Senate committee in budget estimates-----	—5, 633, 342, 403

Chapter	Agency	Budget estimates	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—) Senate bill compared with	
					Estimates	House bill
I	District of Columbia	\$2,919,416	\$915,366	\$2,115,366	—\$804,050	+\$1,200,000
II	Legislative	203,950	203,950	964,050	+760,100	+760,100
III	Justice and Commerce	3,952,423	716,536	1,952,423	—2,000,000	+1,235,887
IV	Treasury, RFC	15,625,000	10,200,000	10,925,000	—4,700,000	+725,000
V	Labor-Federal Security	110,710,400	102,607,750	10,470,000	—100,240,400	—92,137,750
VI	Agriculture	190,000	525,000	190,000	—925,000	+190,000
VII	Interior	1,165,000	1,643,430,000	240,000	—1,621,119,200	—2,046,499,840
VIII	Independent Offices	3,436,049,700	2,137,899,840	1,814,930,500	—2,852,468,440	+171,500,500
IX	Defense	2,993,868,440	5,000	141,400,000	+5,000	+5,000
X	Civil Functions, Army	6,526,050,750	6,031,947,750	6,031,947,750	—494,113,000	—
XI	Mutual Security	773,360,000	143,820,000	220,440,000	—552,920,000	+76,620,000
XII	Emergency agencies	6,743,026	6,489,954	1,121,563	—5,621,463	—5,368,391
XIII	Claims and judgments	—	—	—	—	—
	Total	13,867,923,689	10,127,840,780	8,234,586,286	—5,633,342,403	—1,893,254,494

Administrative expenses of Government corporation

[Limitation on amount of corporate funds to be expended]

H. Doc. No.	Authorization, 1952	Estimate, 1953	Recommended in House bill for 1953	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Bill compared with—	
					1952 authorization	1953 estimate
461	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	\$17,750,000	\$14,500,000	\$16,000,000	—\$1,750,000	—\$550,000
						+\$1,500,000

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS

Chapter I

District of Columbia:

Capital outlay, Sewer Division-----	(\$1, 200, 000)
-------------------------------------	-----------------

The committee recommends approval of the following language, contained in Senate Document No. 151:

CAPITAL OUTLAY, SEWER DIVISION

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay, Sewer Division", to remain available until June 30, 1954, \$1,200,000, including such additional amount as may be necessary for the preparation of surveys, plans, and specifications in connection with the construction of stormwater and relief sewers.

Total increase, chapter I-----	(1, 200, 000)
--------------------------------	---------------

Chapter II

Legislative branch:

Senate:

Joint Committee of Inaugural Ceremonies of 1953---	156, 000
Stationery-----	29, 100

House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations, studies and examinations of executive agencies-----	500, 000
Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality policy-----	75, 000

Total increase, chapter II-----	760, 100
---------------------------------	----------

Chapter III

Department of Commerce:

Civil Aeronautics Administration:

Claims, Federal Airport Act-----	1, 235, 887
----------------------------------	-------------

Total increase, chapter III-----	1, 235, 887
----------------------------------	-------------

Chapter IV

Treasury:

Coast Guard:

Operating expenses-----	700, 000
Retired pay-----	25, 000

	725, 000
--	----------

Reconstruction Finance Corporation-----

The committee recommends an increase in the administrative expense limitation from \$14,500,000 to \$16,000,000. This increase is recommended in order to allow the Corporation to continue its efficient operation of the various programs.

Total increase, chapter IV-----	725, 000
---------------------------------	----------

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Chapter V

Department of Labor:

Bureau of Employment Security-----

The committee does not agree with the House report directive not to increase any State's allotment pending the study by Jan. 1, 1953, on determination of costs resulting on revision of State laws and regulations during the last 5 years and the benefits resulting from these changes.

Federal Security Agency:

Public Health Service:

Hospital and medical care, for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy-----

\$250, 000

Total increase, chapter V-----

250, 000

Chapter VI

Department of Agriculture:

Soil Conservation Service:

Water conservation and utilization projects-----

190, 000

Total increase, chapter VI-----

190, 000

Chapter VII

Department of Interior:

Fish and Wildlife Service:

Investigations of resources, acceleration of program of investigating and eradicating predatory sea lamprey of the Great Lakes-----

240, 000

Total increase, chapter VII-----

240, 000

Chapter VIII

Atomic Energy Commission:

Operating expenses-----

106, 188, 000

Plant and equipment-----

The committee recommends that the following language be stricken from the bill:

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment," including the purchase (not to exceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$1,450,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding twenty-five years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Atomic Energy Commission—Continued

of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "plant and equipment," \$1,450,000,000, of which \$1,355,398,000 is for (i) expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of \$3,518,800,000 for the foregoing purposes which the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to enter into pursuant to the authority of this Act as necessary or appropriate to carry out the program as recommended by the National Security Council, approved by the President of the United States, and submitted to the Congress by the Atomic Energy Commission and (ii) settlement and payment of termination claims under such contracts if additional appropriations to permit continuation of performance under such contracts are not hereafter made: Provided, That the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding twenty-five years and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs as provided in the contracts, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs.

Federal Trade Commission, salaries and expenses----

125, 000

Housing and Home Finance Agency:

Defense Housing:

The committee recommends that the following language be stricken from the bill:

No part of this appropriation may be used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long as that agency proceeds with any public-housing project after such project has been rejected or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing body has recognized local liability to reimburse the Federal Government for funds, if any, advanced on such project prior to such cancellations.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Federal Trade Commission, salaries and expenses—Continued

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

No part of this appropriation may be used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long as that agency proceeds with any public-housing project after such project has been rejected or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing body has tendered the United States full reimbursement of Federal funds advanced on such project prior to such cancellation and a release from all obligations incurred under such project.

Smithsonian Institution:

National Gallery of Art, salaries and expenses-----	\$187, 500
---	------------

The committee recommends the additional sum for the replacement of air-conditioning machinery for the protection of the works of art.

Tennessee Valley Authority-----	65, 000, 000
---------------------------------	--------------

The committee recommends that the limitation on travel expenses in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, be increased from \$1,546,650 to \$1,750,000.

War Claims Commission, salaries and expenses-----

The committee recommends that the amount available for administrative expenses is hereby increased from \$100,000, as approved by the House, to \$400,000.

Total increase, chapter VIII-----	171, 500, 500
-----------------------------------	---------------

Chapter IX

Department of Defense:

Office of the Secretary of Defense, Military Construction, Foreign Countries-----	140, 000, 000
--	---------------

Total increase, chapter IX-----	140, 000, 000
---------------------------------	---------------

Chapter X

Department of the Army, Civil Functions:

Rivers and Harbors-----	5, 000
-------------------------	--------

The committee recommends the additional sum to initiate construction of an entrance jetty and channel at Jones Inlet, New York, with the understanding that local interests will advance funds, without interest, for the remainder of the Federal portion of the project.

Flood Control-----

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be added to the bill:

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Department of the Army, Civil Functions—Continued

FLOOD CONTROL

Of the funds available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, not more than \$450,000 shall be available, until expended, for the planning, construction, and furnishing by the Corps of Engineers of adequate elementary and high school facilities in the new combined municipality (commonly referred to as Newtown) in North Dakota, which is for the acquisition of and to replace the school facilities in the villages of Sanish and Van Hook, North Dakota, which are located within areas acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on said river, conditional upon Newtown School District No. 1, Mouñtrail County, North Dakota, wherein such new combined municipality is located, contributing to the cost of such planning, construction, and furnishing the maximum amount of money which can be provided through a bond issue within the general debt limitation permitted by law for such school district.

Total increase, chapter X-----\$5, 000

Chapter XII

Emergency Agencies:

Office of Defense Mobilization-----	250, 000
Defense Production Administration-----	250, 000
Small Defense Plants Administration, salaries and expenses-----	500, 000
Department of Commerce:	
Salaries and expenses, Defense Production activities--	7, 500, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$7,500,000 above the amount allowed by the House to be allocated as follows:

Department of Commerce—Salaries and expenses, defense production activities, fiscal year 1953

Organization unit	Amount requested	House allowance	Senate committee
Office of International Trade-----	\$185,000	0	\$138,750
Industry Evaluation Board-----	231,000	0	173,250
Office of Transportation-----	100,000	0	75,000
Office of Industry and Commerce-----	60,000	0	45,000
Office of the Secretary-----	374,000	\$200,000	330,500
National Production Authority-----	26,900,000	19,500,000	25,050,000
Office of Field Service-----	7,150,000	5,300,000	6,687,500
Total-----	35,000,000	25,000,000	32,500,000

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Emergency Agencies—Continued

Department of Interior:

Salaries and expenses, Defense Production activities--

\$1, 000, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$1,000,000 above the amount allowed by the House or a total of \$3,500,000 to be allocated as follows:

	Appropriated, 1952	Budget estimate, 1953	House bill	Senate committee
(1) Office of the Secretary.....	\$232, 200	\$189, 000	\$118, 125	\$65, 375
(2) Defense Solid Fuels Administration.....	448, 400	430, 000	268, 750	376, 250
(3) Defense Electric Power Administration.....	996, 600	954, 000	596, 250	834, 750
(4) Defense Fisheries Administration.....	116, 400	112, 000	70, 000	98, 000
(5) Petroleum Administration for Defense.....	2, 337, 100	2, 315, 000	1, 446, 875	2, 025, 625
(6) Defense Minerals Administration.....	600, 200	-----	-----	-----
(7) Transfers and adjustments.....	414, 100	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	5, 235, 000	4, 000, 000	2, 500, 000	3, 500, 000

Department of Labor:

Salaries and expenses, Defense Production activities--

250, 000

Economic Stabilization Agency, salaries and expenses----

17, 870, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$75,000,000 in lieu of \$57,130,000 as proposed by the House to be allocated as follows:

Economic Stabilization Agency

Organizational unit	President's budget	House allow- ance	Amount requested of Senate committee	Amount allowed by Senate committee
Office of the Administrator.....	\$465, 000	\$350, 000	\$440, 000	\$355, 552
Office of Price Stabilization.....	68, 420, 000	36, 500, 000	62, 000, 000	49, 960, 600
Office of Rent Stabilization.....	15, 000, 000	11, 000, 000	13, 300, 000	10, 718, 140
Wage Stabilization Board.....	15, 930, 000	7, 500, 000	14, 250, 000	11, 483, 650
Salary Stabilization Board.....	3, 315, 000	1, 700, 000	2, 969, 000	2, 392, 420
Railroad and Airline Wage Board.....	120, 000	80, 000	110, 000	89, 638
Total.....	103, 250, 000	57, 130, 000	93, 069, 000	75, 000, 000

The committee also recommends that the following proviso be added to the bill:

: *Provided further, That subparagraph (B) of section 204 (f) (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:*

"(B) In any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, village, or unincorporated area, and"

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

(2) of section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which makes the declaration specified in paragraph (1) (b) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken."

General Services Administration:

Emergency operating expenses----- \$3, 000, 000

Federal Civil Defense Administration:

Operations----- 12, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$20,000,000 of which \$4,000,000 is for warehousing in lieu of \$8,000,000 proposed by the House.

Emergency supplies and equipment----- 50, 000, 000

Total increase, chapter XII----- 92, 620, 000

Chapter XIII

Claims, audited claims, and judgments----- 253, 072

Total increase, chapter XIII----- 253, 072

Chapter XIV

General provisions:

The committee recommends that the maximum amount allowable for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), be fixed at \$1,600 in lieu of \$1,400 as proposed by the House.

Total increases, all chapters----- 407, 779, 559

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS

Chapter V

Department of Labor:

Office of the Secretary-----

The committee recommends that the following language be stricken from the bill:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount which may be expended for one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) carried under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act 1953 is hereby increased from "\$3,000" to "\$5,000".

Federal Security Agency:

Office of Education:

Payments to school districts, 1952----- 11, 570, 000

School construction----- 80, 000, 000

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Public Health Service:

Increased costs of pay and allowances-----

\$817, 750

The committee recommends that a total of \$817,750 for increased costs of pay and allowances be stricken from the bill as follows:

"Venereal diseases", \$16,500;

"Tuberculosis", \$23,250;

"Assistance to States, general", \$37,500;

"Communicable diseases", \$69,750;

"Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene", \$61,500;

"Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska", \$7,500;

"Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services", \$9,000;

"Hospitals and medical care", \$388,000;

"Foreign quarantine service", \$15,000;

"National Institutes of Health, operating expenses", \$48,750;

"National Cancer Institute", \$25,500;

"Mental health activities", \$16,500;

"National Heart Institute", \$22,500;

"Dental health activities", \$20,250;

"Retired pay of commissioned officers", \$36,000;

"Salaries and expenses", \$20,250.

Total decrease, chapter V-----

92, 387, 750

Chapter VII

Department of Interior:

National Park Service:

Construction-----

525, 000

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be stricken from the bill:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$525,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That restrictions contained within the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952, limiting the amounts which may be expended from appropriations to the National Park Service for personal services, are hereby waived to the extent necessary to meet the costs of fire suppression and of emergency reconstruction or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes.

Total decrease, chapter VII-----

525, 000

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS--Continued

Chapter VIII

Executive Office of the President:

Extraordinary alterations and repairs, Executive Mansion-----

It is recommended by the committee that the following paragraph be stricken from the bill:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

EXTRAORDINARY ALTERATIONS AND REPAIRS,
EXECUTIVE MANSION

Not to exceed \$50,000 of funds made available to the President under the heading "Emergency Fund for the President, National Defense", contained in the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953", shall be available until June 30, 1954, for extraordinary alterations, repairs, furniture, and furnishings of the Executive Mansion and the White House Office, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act.

Veterans' Administration:

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines:

A request for \$5,000,000 for construction and equipping of a hospital in the Philippines is denied by the committee at this time. The committee looks with favor upon this program but agrees with the House and urges that there be a readvertisement for bids with a view to securing a substantial reduction in the estimate for the construction of this hospital.

Chapter IX

Department of Defense:

Military Public Works:

Department of the Army:

Military Construction-----	\$600, 090, 000
----------------------------	-----------------

Department of the Navy:

Public Works-----	386, 409, 840
-------------------	---------------

Department of the Air Force:

Acquisition and construction of real property---	1, 200, 000, 000
--	------------------

Department of the Army:

Alaska Communications System:

Construction-----

It is recommended by the committee that the following language be stricken from the bill:

: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the funds herein made available shall be available for painting the exterior of the Jesse Lee Children's Home at Seward, Alaska.

Total decrease, chapter IX-----	2, 186, 499, 840
---------------------------------	------------------

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Chapter XI

Mutual Security:

General Provisions:

The committee recommends that the following language be added to the bill:

, including not to exceed \$186,900 for salaries and expenses for operating a publicity office in the District of Columbia,

It is recommended that the following language be stricken from the bill:

No part of any appropriation made by this Chapter for any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal services in excess of an amount equal to 85 per centum of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for the payment of personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 15 per centum of the amount requested in such budget estimates for personal services for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

(b) This section shall not apply to—

(1) not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

(2) positions filled from within the Mutual Security Agency and related Government functions provided for in this Act;

(3) offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice

and consent of the Senate:

Provided further, That subsection (1) of paragraph (b) shall operate to accomplish the provisions of paragraph (a), and the said 85 per centum shall not be exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953: *And provided further*, That each agency shall impound and deposit in the general fund of the Treasury as soon as practicable, but not less frequently than quarterly, an amount equivalent to the savings resulting from the vacant positions which are prohibited from being filled by this section, based on the salaries of the prior incumbents of the positions.

Chapter XII

Small Defense Plants Revolving fund-----	\$1, 500, 000
Federal Civil Defense Administration:	
Federal contributions-----	14, 500, 000
Total decrease, chapter XII-----	16, 000, 000

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Chapter XIII

Judgments and Audited Claims:

Motor carrier claims-----	\$5, 621, 463
---------------------------	---------------

Chapter XIV

General provisions:

The committee recommends that the following section be stricken from the bill:

SEC. 1211. During the current fiscal year, personnel and appropriations or funds available for salaries and expenses to any department, agency, or corporation in the executive branch of the Government, shall be transferred to any defense activity under the jurisdiction of such department or agency in such numbers or amounts as may be necessary for the discharge of responsibilities relating to the national defense assigned to such department, agency, or corporation by or pursuant to law.

Total decreases, all chapters-----	2, 301, 034, 053
Total increases, all chapters-----	407, 779, 559
Total net decrease-----	1, 893, 254, 494
Amount of bill as reported to Senate-----	8, 234, 586, 286

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate com- mittee	Increase (+) or decrease (—) Senate bill compared with—	
					Estimates	House bill
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
460	Reorganization expenses.....	\$100,000			—\$100,000	
	FISCAL SERVICE					
460	Salaries and expenses, 1952.....	70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000		
	COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT FUND EXPENSES					
502	District government retirement and relief funds.....	397,000	397,000	397,000		
460	District Debt Service, 1952.....	54,692	54,692	54,692		
	REGULATORY AGENCIES					
	OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL					
502	Salaries and expenses.....	188,750	125,000	125,000	—63,750	
	PUBLIC SCHOOLS					
460	Operating expenses, Public School Food Services Fund.....	25,000	25,000	25,000		
	OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE					
460	Salaries and expenses.....	725,000	100,000	100,000	—625,000	
	REDEVELOPMENT LAND					
460	Agency, 1952 and prior.....	5,020	5,020	5,020		
	HEALTH DEPARTMENT					
460	Medical charities, 1950.....	92,613	92,613	92,613		
	PUBLIC WORKS					
151	Capital outlay, sewer division.....	1,200,000		1,200,000		+\$1,200,000

460	Operating expenses, electrical division, 1951.....	19,341	19,341	19,341	-----
460	Repairs to Old Bay Line pier.....	42,000	26,700	26,700	-15,300
	Total, chapter I.....	2,919,416	915,366	2,115,366	-804,050
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				(+1,200,000)
	SENATE				
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE				
	Inaugural ceremonies.....			156,000	+156,000
	Stationery.....			29,100	+29,100
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES				
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE				
	House Appropriations Committee.....			500,000	+500,000
518	Stationery (revolving fund), 1952.....	132,200	132,200	132,200	-----
	Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.....			75,000	+75,000
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
521	House Office Building.....	48,750	48,750	48,750	-----
521	House restaurants.....	23,000	23,000	23,000	-----
	Total, Chapter II.....	203,950	203,950	964,050	+760,100
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
	IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE				
S. 152	Salaries and expenses.....	2,000,000			-2,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
	CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION				
452	Claims, Federal Airport Act.....	585,536	585,536	585,536	-----
S. 156	Claims, Federal Airport Act.....	1,235,887		1,235,887	+1,235,887
	NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS				
452	Emergency facilities, radiation physics laboratory.....	131,000	131,000	131,000	-----
	Total, chapter III.....	3,952,423	716,536	1,952,423	-2,000,000
					+1,235,887

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate com- mittee	Increase (+) or decrease (—) Senate bill compared with—	
					Estimates	House bill
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT					
	COAST GUARD					
486	Operating expenses	\$5,900,000	\$4,500,000	\$5,200,000	—\$700,000	+\$700,000
450	Acquisition, construction, and improvement	9,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	—4,000,000	-----
486	Retired pay	625,000	600,000	625,000	-----	+\$25,000
486	Reserve training	100,000	100,000	100,000	-----	-----
	Total, chapter IV	15,625,000	10,200,000	10,925,000	—4,700,000	+\$725,000
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY					
506	Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration	13,600,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	—6,800,000	-----
506	Mexican Farm Labor Program, salaries and expenses	3,000,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	—200,000	-----
506	Farm labor supply revolving fund	270,000	-----	-----	—270,000	-----
	Total, Department of Labor	16,870,000	9,600,000	9,600,000	—7,270,000	-----
	FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY					
503	American Printing House for the Blind	90,000	60,000	60,000	—30,000	-----

OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
495	Salaries and expenses.....	177,000	60,000	60,000	-117,000
455	Payments to school districts (1952).....	11,570,000	11,570,000	11,570,000	-11,570,000
511	School construction.....	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	-80,000,000
	Total, Office of Education.....	91,747,000	91,630,000	91,630,000	-91,637,000
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
487	Pay costs, Public Law 346.....	961,000	817,750	817,750	-817,750
509	Hospitals and medical care.....	1,042,400	500,000	750,000	-292,400
	Total, Public Health Service.....	2,003,400	1,317,750	750,000	-1,253,400
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR					
505	Defense Community Facilities and Services, salaries and expenses.....	1 (100,000)	1 (50,000)	1 (50,000)	(-50,000)
	Total, Federal Security Agency.....	93,840,400	93,007,750	870,000	-92,970,400
	Total, chapter V.....	110,710,400	102,607,750	10,470,000	-92,137,750
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Soil Conservation Service:					
	Water conservation and utilization projects.....	190,000		190,000	+190,000
	Total, chapter VI.....	190,000		190,000	+190,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
160	Research in the utilization of saline water.....	400,000			-400,000
456	National Park Service: Construction.....	525,000	525,000		-525,000
159	Fish and Wildlife Service: Investigation of resources.....	240,000		240,000	+240,000
	Total, chapter VII.....	1,165,000	525,000	240,000	-925,000
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
492	Extraordinary Alterations and Repairs, Executive Mansion.....	50,000	(1)		-50,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 19.

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended \$ in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate com- mittee	Increase (+) or decrease (—) Senate bill compared with—	
					Estimates	House bill
INDEPENDENT OFFICES						
	American Battle Monuments Commission:					
377	Dedication of World War II memorial.....	\$36,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	—\$6,000	-----
476	Atomic Energy Commission:					
	Salaries and expenses.....	3,191,000,000			—3,191,000,000	-----
	Operating expenses.....		35,000,000	141,188,000	+141,188,000	+106,188,000
	Plant and equipment.....		1,450,000,000	1,450,000,000	+1,450,000,000	-----
S. 128	Federal Trade Commission.....	300,000		125,000	—175,000	+125,000
	General Services Administration:					
S. 155	Remodeling Congress Street Post Office, Chicago, Ill.....	576,200			—576,000	-----
467	Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia.....	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000		-----
	Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
	Office of the Administrator:					
507	Defense Housing.....	62,500,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	—12,500,000	-----
507	Federal National Mortgage Association.....	(2)	(2)	(2)		-----
507	Alaska Housing.....	5,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	—1,000,000	-----
	Slum Clearance and Urban Redevelopment:					
507	Capital Grants.....	10,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	—2,000,000	-----
507	Public Housing Administration.....	(1)	(2)	(2)		-----
S. 153	Smithsonian Institution: National Gallery of Art.....	187,500		187,500		+187,500
476	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	150,000,000	85,000,000	150,000,000		+65,000,000
	Veterans' Administration:					
451	Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	5,000,000			—5,000,000	-----

466 War Claims Commission:

Administrative expenses-----

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Maritime Activities:

470 Ship construction-----

470 War Shipping Administration liquidation-----

Total, Chapter VIII-----

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

TITLE I

MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

485 Office of Secretary of Defense (military construction, foreign countries)-----

485 Department of the Army (military construction)-----

485 Department of the Navy (public works)-----

485 Department of the Air Force (acquisition and construction of real property)-----

Total, military public works-----

TITLE II

488 Department of the Army (construction, Alaska Communications System)-----

Total, chapter IX-----

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Rivers and Harbors-----

Total, chapter X-----

¹ To be derived by transfer.

² Of this amount, \$1,355,938,000 is for expenditure during 1953 or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of \$3,518,800,000.

³ Not to exceed \$50,000 of the funds available for "Emergency Fund for the President, National Defense" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, made available until June 30, 1954, for this purpose in House bill; Senate bill eliminates the item.

⁴ Administrative expense limitation for 1953 increased by \$803,000.

⁵ Administrative expense limitation for 1953 increased by \$683,000.

⁶ Administrative expense limitation for 1953 increased by \$1,903,000.

⁷ Administrative expense limitation for 1953 increased by \$1,433,735.

⁸ Additional \$400,000 from the war claims fund made available in 1953 for administrative expenses.

⁹ Additional \$100,000 from the war claims fund made available in 1953 for administrative expenses.

¹⁰ Not to exceed \$200,000 of the unobligated balance of prior year funds to be continued available.

¹¹ War Shipping Administration liquidation funds made available for payment of claims against "Working fund, Commerce, War Shipping Administration functions, December 31, 1946."

	(6)	(7)	(8)	
	(6)	(7)	(8)	
	3,436,049,700	1,643,430,000	1,814,930,500	+171,500,500
	650,000,000		140,000,000	+140,000,000
	414,515,000	600,000,000		-600,000,000
	387,972,740	386,409,840		-386,409,840
	1,538,000,000	1,200,000,000		-1,200,000,000
	2,990,487,740	2,186,499,840	140,000,000	-2,046,499,840
	3,380,700	1,400,000	1,400,000	
	2,993,868,440	2,187,899,840	141,400,000	-2,046,499,840
			5,000	+5,000
			5,000	+5,000

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Agency and item	Appropriation, 1952	Estimates, 1953	Recommended in House bill	Amount rec- ommended by Senate Committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—) Senate bill compared with	
						Appropriation, 1952	Estimates, 1953
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS						
285	Government and Relief in Occupied Areas.....	\$22,500,000	\$12,820,000	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000	—\$11,500,000	—\$1,820,000
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
285	Government in Occupied Areas.....	26,880,000	20,500,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	—7,880,000	—1,500,000
510 512	MUTUAL SECURITY						
	TITLE I—EUROPE						
	Military Assistance.....	4,165,542,937	3,415,614,750	3,128,224,750	3,128,224,750	—1,037,318,207	—237,390,000
	Economic and Technical Assistance.....	1,509,072,890	1,282,443,000	1,282,433,000	1,282,433,000	—226,639,890	—10,000
	Assistance to Spain.....	100,000,000	(11)	(11)	(11)	—100,000,000	
	TITLE II—NEAR EAST AND AFRICA						
	Military Assistance.....	396,250,000	560,316,500	499,116,500	499,116,500	+102,866,500	—61,200,000
	Technical Cooperation.....	56,256,000	50,822,750	50,822,750	50,822,750	—5,433,250	
	Palestine Refugees.....	50,000,000	60,063,250	60,063,250	60,063,250	+10,063,250	
	Israel Refugees.....	50,000,000	70,228,000	70,228,000	70,228,000	+20,228,000	
	TITLE III—ASIA AND PACIFIC						
	Military Assistance.....	688,444,000	564,807,500	540,807,500	540,807,500	—147,636,500	—24,000,000
	Economic Assistance (MSA).....	144,305,866	202,778,250	202,778,250	202,778,250	+58,472,384	
	Technical Cooperation (TCA).....	87,793,000	118,634,250	67,793,000	67,793,000	—20,000,000	—50,841,250

Contributions to United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency-----		45,000,000				-45,000,000	
TITLE IV--AMERICAN REPUBLICS							
Military Assistance-----	38,150,000	57,685,750	51,685,750	51,685,750	+13,535,750	-6,000,000	
Technical Cooperation-----	17,845,653	20,329,000	20,329,000	20,329,000	+2,483,347		
TITLE V--MISCELLANEOUS ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE							
Movement of Migrants-----	10,000,000	9,240,500	9,240,500	9,240,500	-759,500		
Ocean Freight--Voluntary Relief Packages-----	2,843,610	2,587,500	2,587,500	2,587,500	-256,110		
Multilateral Technical Cooperation-----	12,400,000	15,708,750	9,171,333	9,171,333	-3,228,667	-6,537,417	
Contributions to United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund-----		16,481,000	6,666,667	6,666,667	+6,666,667	-9,814,333	
Subtotal, Mutual Security-----	7,328,903,976	¹² 6,492,740,750	¹² 6,001,947,750	6,001,947,750	-1,326,956,226	-490,793,000	
Total, Chapter XI-----	7,378,283,976	6,526,060,750	6,031,947,750	6,031,947,750	-1,346,336,226	-494,113,000	

¹⁰ For Mutual Security, 1952 appropriations are shown as adjusted for comparability to 1953 appropriation structure.

¹¹ Not less than \$25,000,000 of title I made available plus unobligated balance of \$100,000,000.

¹² In addition, authority to continue available unobligated balances of prior years funds, estimated by agencies at \$539,511,223 at the time of budget submission but now estimated to be \$809,865,882.

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate com- mittee	Increase (+) or decrease (–) Senate bill compared with—	
					Estimates	House bill
504	EMERGENCY AGENCIES					
	DEFENSE PRODUCTION					
	Office of Defense Mobilization.....	\$1,550,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,250,000	–\$300,000	+\$250,000
	Defense Production Administration.....	3,500,000	2,750,000	3,000,000	–500,000	+\$250,000
	Defense Transport Administration.....	2,500,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	–300,000	-----
	Economic Stabilization Agency.....	103,250,000	57,130,000	75,000,000	–28,250,000	+\$17,870,000
	Small Defense Plants Administration:					
	Salaries and expenses.....	4,200,000	3,500,000	4,000,000	–200,000	+\$500,000
	Revolving fund.....	5,000,000	3,000,000	1,500,000	–3,500,000	–\$1,500,000
	Federal Security Agency.....	545,000	400,000	400,000	–145,000	-----
	General Services Administration.....	8,500,000	5,000,000	8,000,000	–500,000	+\$3,000,000
	Department of Agriculture.....	3,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	–1,000,000	-----
	Department of Commerce.....	35,000,000	25,000,000	32,500,000	–2,500,000	+\$7,500,000
	Department of the Interior.....	4,000,000	2,500,000	3,500,000	–500,000	+\$1,000,000
	Department of Justice.....	215,000	90,000	90,000	–125,000	-----
	Department of Labor.....	2,100,000	1,750,000	2,000,000	–100,000	+\$250,000
	Total, defense production activities.....	173,300,000	106,320,000	135,440,000	–37,920,000	+\$29,120,000
285	FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION					
	Operations.....	32,000,000	8,000,000	20,000,000	–12,000,000	+\$12,000,000
	Federal contributions.....	50,000,000	29,500,000	15,000,000	–35,000,000	–\$14,500,000

Emergency supplies and equipment-----	243, 000, 000	-----	50, 000, 000	-193, 000, 000	+50, 000, 000
Protective facilities-----	250, 000, 000	-----	-----	-250, 000, 000	-----
Civil defense procurement fund-----	25, 000, 000	-----	-----	-25, 000, 000	-----
Total, Civil Defense Administration-----	600, 000, 000	37, 500, 000	85, 000, 000	-515, 000, 000	+47, 500, 000
Total, Chapter XII-----	773, 360, 000	143, 820, 000	220, 440, 000	-552, 920, 000	+76, 620, 000
517 Judgments and authorized claims-----	6, 743, 026	6, 489, 954	1, 121, 563	-5, 621, 463	-5, 368, 391
13 144					
13 154					
13 157					
Total, Chapter XIII-----	6, 743, 026	6, 489, 954	1, 121, 563	-5, 621, 463	-5, 368, 391

13 Senate documents.

O

Calendar No. 2001

82^d CONGRESS
2^d SESSION

H. R. 8370

[Report No. 2076]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 2 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1952

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 2, 1952

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of July 2 (legislative day, June 27), 1952, by Mr. McKELLAR, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply sup-
5 plemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1953, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FISCAL SERVICE

10 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Salaries
11 and expenses, Fiscal Service", \$70,000.

1 COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT FUND EXPENSES

2 DISTRICT GOVERNMENT RETIREMENT AND RELIEF FUNDS

3 For an additional amount for "District government re-
4 tirement and relief funds", \$397,000.

5 DISTRICT DEBT SERVICE

6 For reimbursement to the Treasury of the United States
7 for the amount paid to the Pan American Union under the
8 provisions of Public Law 902, approved December 29, 1950,
9 \$54,692.

10 REGULATORY AGENCIES

11 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses for "Office of Administrator of
14 Rent Control", \$125,000, of which not less than \$27,000
15 shall be available for payment of terminal leave only: *Pro-*
16 *vided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon
17 enactment into law of authorizing legislation for the purposes
18 of rent control in the District of Columbia.

19 PUBLIC SCHOOLS

20 OPERATING EXPENSES

21 PUBLIC SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES FUND

22 For crediting to the public school food services fund,
23 in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia
24 Public School Food Services Act (Public Law 159, ap-
25 proved October 8, 1951), \$25,000.

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil Defense, including personal services without reference to the civil service laws as related to recruitment; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$100,000.

REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

For payment of per diem for the fiscal year 1952 of members of the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia, \$5,020: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for the payment of such per diem for services rendered prior to July 1, 1950.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MEDICAL CHARITIES

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "Medical charities", \$92,613.

PUBLIC WORKS

OPERATING EXPENSES, ELECTRICAL DIVISION

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1951, for "Operating expenses, Electrical Division", \$19,341.

CAPITAL OUTLAY, SEWER DIVISION

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay, Sewer Division", to remain available until June 30, 1954, \$1,200,000, including such additional amount as may be

1 *necessary for the preparation of surveys, plans, and speci-*
2 *fications in connection with the construction of storm-water*
3 *and relief sewers.*

4 REPAIRS TO OLD BAY LINE PIER

5 For emergency repairs to Old Bay Line pier, Washing-
6 ton Channel, \$26,700, which amount shall be transferred
7 to the Department of the Army and be expended under the
8 direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision
9 of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until
10 expended.

1 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

12 The sums appropriated in this Act for the District of
13 Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for,
14 be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia,
15 as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts
16 for the fiscal years involved.

17 CHAPTER II

18 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

19 SENATE

20 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

21 *Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1953: To*
22 *enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary ex-*
23 *penses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the*
24 *United States, January 20, 1953, in accordance with such*
25 *program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the*

1 *Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a con-*
 2 *current resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for*
 3 *extra police, \$156,000.*

4 *Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery*
 5 *of \$300 for each Senator and the President of the Senate*
 6 *for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress,*
 7 *\$29,100, to remain available for obligation until January*
 8 *2, 1953.*

9 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 *For an additional amount for salaries and expenses,*
 11 *studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Com-*
 12 *mittee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Com-*
 13 *mittee on Appropriations Resolution Numbered 11, adopted*
 14 *by the committee on July 2, 1952, \$500,000.*

15 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

16 *Stationery (revolving fund) : For an additional amount*
 17 *for "Stationery (revolving fund)", \$132,200, including an*
 18 *additional stationery allowance of \$300 for each Repre-*
 19 *sentative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from*
 20 *Puerto Rico, for the second session of the Eighty-second*
 21 *Congress, to remain available until expended.*

22 JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

23 POLICY

24 *For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on*
 25 *Immigration and Nationality Policy, including the objects*

1 specified in title IV of Public Law 414, Eighty-second Con-
 2 gress, \$75,000, of which one-half shall be available for
 3 payment from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half
 4 shall be available for payment from the contingent fund of
 5 the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the
 6 chairman of such committee or by any member of such com-
 7 mittee duly authorized by the chairman.

8 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

9 For an additional amount for "House Office Buildings":
 10 \$48,750.

11 House Restaurants: For structural and mechanical
 12 changes, labor, materials, equipment, and all other necessary
 13 items to provide facilities for carry-out food service in the
 14 New and Old House Office Buildings, to be operated as part of
 15 the House of Representatives restaurants, \$23,000.

16 CHAPTER III

17 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

18 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

19 CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

20 For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Air-
 21 port Act", \$585,536, as follows: Travis Field, Savannah,
 22 Georgia, \$51,797; Municipal Airport, Hutchinson, Kansas,
 23 \$43,961; Salisbury-Wicomico Airport, Salisbury, Maryland,

1 \$25,096; Holman Field, St. Paul, Minnesota, \$174,327;
 2 Municipal Airport, Dayton, Ohio, \$289,294; Kitsap County
 3 Airport, Kitsap, Washington, \$1,061.

4 *For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Air-*
 5 *port Act", \$1,235,887, to remain available until June 30,*
 6 *1953, as follows: Municipal Airport, Tulsa, Oklahoma,*
 7 *\$111,106; Orange County Airport, Orange County, Cali-*
 8 *fornia, \$53,604; Bakersfield-Kern County Airport Number*
 9 *1, Kern County (Bakersfield), California, \$45,719; Munic-*
 10 *ipal Airport, Bainbridge, Georgia, \$54,196; Municipal Air-*
 11 *port, Cleveland, Ohio, \$347,605; Municipal Airport, Bev-*
 12 *erly, Massachusetts, \$40,258; Municipal Airport, Orlando,*
 13 *Florida, \$246,618; Municipal Airport, Fort Wayne, In-*
 14 *diana, \$198,896; Municipal Airport, New Bedford, Massa-*
 15 *chusetts, \$30,580; Lambert-Saint Louis Municipal Airport,*
 16 *Saint Louis, Missouri, \$25,409; Municipal Airport, Grand*
 17 *Island, Nebraska, \$71,617; Cape May County Airport,*
 18 *Cape May County, New Jersey, \$10,279.*

19 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

20 EMERGENCY FACILITIES, RADIATION PHYSICS LABORATORY

21 For expenses necessary for construction of a Radium
 22 Laboratory and an annex to the Betatron Building,
 23 \$131,000.

1

CHAPTER IV

2

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

3

COAST GUARD

4

OPERATING EXPENSES

5

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses",

6

~~\$4,500,000~~ \$5,200,000.

7

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

8

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction,

9

and improvements", \$5,000,000, to remain available until

10

expended.

11

RETIRED PAY

12

For an additional amount for "Retired pay", ~~\$600,000~~

13

\$625,000.

14

RESERVE TRAINING

15

For an additional amount for "Reserve training",

16

\$100,000.

17

GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

18

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

19

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

20

Not to exceed ~~\$14,500,000~~ \$16,000,000 (to be com-

21

puted on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Reconstruction

22

Finance Corporation shall be available during the current

23

fiscal year for its administrative expenses, including hire of

24

passenger motor vehicles; and use of the services and facilities

25

of the Federal Reserve banks: *Provided*, That as used herein

1 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to in-
 2 clude all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract
 3 or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the pur-
 4 chase of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices:
 5 *Provided further*, That the limiting amount heretofore stated
 6 for administrative expenses shall be increased by an amount
 7 which does not exceed the aggregate cost of salaries, wages,
 8 travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside the
 9 continental United States; the expenses of services per-
 10 formed on a contract or fee basis in connection with termi-
 11 nation of contracts or in the performance of legal services;
 12 and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other
 13 Government agencies: *Provided further*, That the distribu-
 14 tion of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Cor-
 15 poration shall be made in accordance with generally recog-
 16 nized accounting principles and practices.

17 CHAPTER V

18 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

19 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

20 Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount
 21 which may be expended for one passenger motor vehicle
 22 (for replacement only) carried under this head in the
 23 Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby
 24 increased from "\$3,000" to "\$5,000".

1 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
2 GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION
3 AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

4 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for
5 unemployment compensation and employment service admin-
6 istration", \$6,800,000.

7 MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses, not otherwise pro-
9 vided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Depart-
10 ment of Labor under the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public
11 Law 78), including temporary employment of persons with-
12 out regard to the civil service laws, \$2,800,000: *Provided,*
13 That the general provisions applicable to the Department
14 of Labor contained in the Labor-Federal Security Appro-
15 priation Act, 1953, shall apply to the funds appropriated
16 herein in the same manner as if this appropriation were a
17 part of that Act.

18 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

19 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

20 EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

21 For an additional amount for "Education of the Blind",
22 \$60,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
\$60,000.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Pay-
ments to school districts", \$11,570,000.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "School construction",
\$80,000,000 to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For additional amounts for increased costs of pay and
allowances authorized by Public Law 346, approved May 19,
1952, as follows:

"Venereal diseases", \$16,500;

"Tuberculosis", \$23,250;

"Assistance to States, general", \$37,500;

"Communicable diseases", \$69,750;

"Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene",
\$61,500;

"Disease and sanitation investigations and control,
Territory of Alaska", \$7,500;

1 “Salaries and expenses, hospital construction serv-
2 ices”, \$9,000;

3 “Hospitals and medical care”, \$388,000;

4 “Foreign quarantine service”, \$15,000;

5 “National Institutes of Health, operating expenses”,
6 \$48,750;

7 “National Cancer Institute”, \$25,500;

8 “Mental health activities”, \$16,500;

9 “National Heart Institute”, \$22,500;

10 “Dental health activities”, \$20,250;

11 “Retired pay of commissioned officers”, \$36,000;

12 “Salaries and expenses”, \$20,250.

13 HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL CARE

14 For an additional amount for “Hospitals and medical
15 care” ~~\$500,000~~ \$750,000; and this amount shall be exclu-
16 sively available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for
17 care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy.

18 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE COMMUNITY

20 FACILITIES AND SERVICES

21 For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses,
22 Defense Community Facilities and Services”, \$50,000, to
23 be derived by transfer from the appropriation “Defense Com-
24 munity Facilities and Services, Federal Security Agency”:

1 *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this
2 head shall be obligated after December 31, 1952 except for
3 liquidation of the program.

4 *CHAPTER VI*

5 *DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE*

6 *SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE*

7 *WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS*

8 *For an additional amount for "Water conservation and*
9 *utilization projects", \$190,000, to remain available until*
10 *expended.*

11 *CHAPTER VII*

12 *DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR*

13 *NATIONAL PARK SERVICE*

14 *CONSTRUCTION*

15 *For an additional amount for "Construction", \$525,000,*
16 *to remain available until expended: Provided, That restric-*
17 *tions contained within the Interior Department Appropria-*
18 *tion Act, 1952, limiting the amounts which may be expended*
19 *from appropriations to the National Park Service for per-*
20 *sonal services, are hereby waived to the extent necessary*
21 *to meet the costs of fire suppression and of emergency*
22 *reconstruction or replacement of facilities damaged or de-*
23 *stroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes,*

1 *FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE*2 *INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES*

3 *For an additional amount for "Investigations of re-*
4 *sources", fiscal year 1953, \$240,000.*

5 CHAPTER VII VIII

6 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

7 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

8 EXTRAORDINARY ALTERATIONS AND REPAIRS, EXECUTIVE

9 MANSION

10 Not to exceed \$50,000 of funds made available to the
11 President under the heading "Emergency Fund for the
12 President, National Defense", contained in the "Independent
13 Offices Appropriation Act, 1953", shall be available until
14 June 30, 1954, for extraordinary alterations, repairs, furni-
15 ture, and furnishings of the Executive Mansion and the
16 White House Office, to be expended as the President may
17 determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any
18 other Act.

19 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

20 DEDICATION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIALS

21 For expenses necessary for an appropriate dedication
22 of World War II memorials, erected under authority of the
23 Act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 123), to be available
24 for such purposes as the Commission may deem necessary
25 and proper and without regard to the provisions of other

1 laws or regulations relating to the expenditure of public
 2 funds (except that this exemption shall not be construed as
 3 waiving the requirement for the submission of accounts and
 4 vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit) , \$30,-
 5 000, to be immediately available and to remain available
 6 until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That, when in the discretion
 7 of the American Battle Monuments Commission it would
 8 be in the public interest, personnel and transportation facili-
 9 ties of any other Government agency may be furnished by
 10 such agency, without reimbursement, to the Commission
 11 for the purposes of this appropriation.

12 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

13 Operating expenses: For an additional amount for "Op-
 14 erating expenses", including the hire of passenger motor
 15 vehicles, ~~\$35,000,000~~, of which ~~\$30,000,000~~ shall be avail-
 16 able only for the weapons program ~~\$141,188,000~~: *Provided*,
 17 That appropriations granted to the Commission under this
 18 head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available in amounts
 19 not to exceed ~~\$25,064,275~~ \$30,755,526 for expenses of pro-
 20 gram direction and administration personnel, and not to
 21 exceed ~~\$2,709,350~~ \$3,657,647 for expenses of travel.

22 Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for
 23 "Plant and equipment", including the purchase (not to ex-
 24 ceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor
 25 vehicles, ~~\$1,450,000,000~~: *Provided*, That in connection with

1 the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the
2 Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of
3 the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify
4 existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for
5 periods not exceeding twenty-five years, and such contracts
6 shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon pay-
7 ment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and
8 any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to
9 the Commission shall be available for the payment of such
10 cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the fore-
11 going appropriation shall be available for the construction
12 of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project,
13 unless funds are available for the completion of such build-
14 ing, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

15 *Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for*
16 *"plant and equipment", \$1,450,000,000, of which \$1,355,-*
17 *398,000 is for (i) expenditures during the fiscal year ending*
18 *June 30, 1953, or thereafter under contracts and against*
19 *other obligations in an aggregate amount of \$3,518,800,000*
20 *for the foregoing purposes which the Atomic Energy Com-*
21 *mission is authorized to enter into pursuant to the authority*
22 *of this Act as necessary or appropriate to carry out the*
23 *program as recommended by the National Security Council,*
24 *approved by the President of the United States, and sub-*
25 *mitted to the Congress by the Atomic Energy Commission*

1 *and (ii) settlement and payment of termination claims under*
 2 *such contracts if additional appropriations to permit continua-*
 3 *tion of performance under such contracts are not hereafter*
 4 *made: Provided, That the Commission is authorized without*
 5 *regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into*
 6 *new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for*
 7 *electric utility services for periods not exceeding twenty-five*
 8 *years and such contracts shall be subject to termination by*
 9 *the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs as pro-*
 10 *vided in the contracts, and any appropriation presently or*
 11 *hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available*
 12 *for the payment of such cancellation costs.*

13 COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE
 14 MANSION

15 Appropriations available to the "Commission on Reno-
 16 vation of the Executive Mansion", for fiscal year 1952, shall
 17 remain available until September 30, 1952.

18 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

19 *For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,*
 20 *Federal Trade Commission", \$125,000.*

21 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

22 HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

23 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions
 24 of the Act approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as

1 amended (65 Stat. 657), authorizing the establishment of a
2 hospital center in the District of Columbia, including grants
3 to private agencies for hospital facilities in said District,
4 \$11,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
5 That the foregoing appropriation shall be the total amount to
6 be provided by the Federal Government for the completion
7 of the projects contemplated in connection with such appro-
8 priation: *Provided further*, That appropriations and con-
9 tract authorizations heretofore granted under the head of
10 "Hospital Center, District of Columbia" shall be merged
11 with and accounted for as a part of this appropriation.

12 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

13 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

14 DEFENSE HOUSING

15 For an additional amount for "Defense housing", includ-
16 ing not to exceed \$1,433,735 for administrative expenses
17 of the Public Housing Administration in connection with
18 construction of housing under such appropriation, \$50,-
19 000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
20 That the funds hereby appropriated shall not be available
21 in excess of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be
22 appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Agency
23 for defense housing by title III of the Defense Housing
24 and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951: *Pro-*

1 *vided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation*
2 *shall be used for the construction of any project unless funds*
3 *are available for the completion of such project. No part*
4 *of this appropriation may be used for administrative ex-*
5 *penses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public*
6 *Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long*
7 *as that agency proceeds with any public-housing project*
8 *after such project has been rejected or previous approval*
9 *thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by*
10 *resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing*
11 *body has recognized local liability to reimburse the Federal*
12 *Government for funds, if any, advanced on such project prior*
13 *to such cancellations No part of this appropriation may be*
14 *used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any*
15 *employee within the Public Housing Administration or for*
16 *any other purpose so long as that agency proceeds with any*
17 *public-housing project after such project has been rejected*
18 *or previous approval thereof cancelled by the governing body*
19 *of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote*
20 *and the governing body has tendered the United States full*
21 *reimbursement of Federal funds advanced on such project*
22 *prior to such cancellation and a release from all obligations*
23 *incurred under such project.*

1 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

2 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

3 The amount made available under this head in title III
4 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, for
5 administrative expenses of the Federal National Mortgage
6 Association is increased by \$680,000; and the limitation
7 under said head on the amount available for expenses of
8 travel is increased by \$40,800: *Provided*, That this para-
9 graph shall take effect only upon the enactment into law
10 of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress.

11 ALASKA HOUSING

12 For an additional amount for "Alaska housing",
13 \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
14 That this paragraph shall take effect only upon the enact-
15 ment into law of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress.

16 SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

17 CAPITAL GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN

18 REDEVELOPMENT

19 For payment of capital grants as authorized by title I of
20 the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1453,
21 1456), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in title III of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration is increased by \$1,433,735; and the limitation under said head on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased by \$88,000.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", \$187,500.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For an additional amount for "Tennessee Valley Authority", including the purchase of not to exceed an additional seventy passenger motor vehicles, \$85,000,000 \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided, That the limitation on travel expenses in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby increased from \$1,546,650 to \$1,750,000.*

1 WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

2 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

3 For an additional amount for "Administrative expenses",
4 ~~\$100,000~~ \$400,000, to be derived from the war claims fund
5 created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948
6 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948).

7 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

8 MARITIME ACTIVITIES

9 WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION LIQUIDATION

10 The appropriation made available under this head in the
11 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, shall be avail-
12 able for the payment of obligations incurred against the work-
13 ing fund titled "Working fund, Commerce, War Shipping
14 Administration functions, December 31, 1946".

15 CHAPTER VIII / X

16 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

17 TITLE I—MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

18 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

19 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FOREIGN COUNTRIES

20 *For establishment and development of military installa-*
21 *tions and facilities in foreign countries as authorized by the*
22 *Act of _____, \$140,000,000, to remain*
23 *available until expended.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the Act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 940, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress), and the Act of ———, 1952 (Public Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$5,000,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; \$600,000,000, to remain available until expended. Of total amount appropriated in this paragraph, \$1,980,000 shall be allocated for Camp Crowder, Missouri.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

PUBLIC WORKS

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the Act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of September 11,

1 1950 (Public Law 783, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of
 2 January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress),
 3 the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
 4 second Congress), and the Act of———, 1952 (Public Law
 5 —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), seal coating for
 6 airfield pavements at Naval Station, Adak, Alaska; including
 7 not to exceed \$2,500,000 for advance planning as authorized
 8 by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; \$210,000
 9 for the acquisition of facilities as authorized by said Act of
 10 September 11, 1950; furniture for public quarters; personnel
 11 in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services
 12 necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engi-
 13 neering and architectural services as authorized by section 3
 14 of the Act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556); \$386,409,
 15 840, to remain available until expended.

16 DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

17 ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

18 For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment
 19 of temporary or permanent public works, military installa-
 20 tions, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the
 21 Act of March 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 17), the Act of October
 22 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 936), as amended, the Act of June 17,
 23 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of
 24 January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress),

1 the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
2 second Congress), and the Act of ———, 1952 (Public
3 Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), without
4 regard to sections 1106 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as
5 amended, and the land, and interests therein, may be ac-
6 quired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior
7 to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required
8 by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; not to exceed
9 \$52,620,000 for planning (including advance planning,
10 master planning, and investigational engineering) as au-
11 thorized by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951;
12 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,200,000,000, to
13 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of
14 these funds shall be expended for actual construction of
15 facilities or structures at Grandview Air Terminal, Missouri,
16 until the city of Kansas City, Missouri, has conveyed to the
17 United States Government the fee simple title to all lands
18 required for the base or has given the United States Govern-
19 ment at least a twenty-five year lease to such land on a
20 nominal rental basis.

21 SEC. 802. None of the funds appropriated in this title
22 shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee
23 contract for work where cost estimates exceed \$25,000 to

1 be performed within the continental United States without
2 the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense
3 setting forth the reasons therefor.

4 SEC. 803. None of the funds appropriated in this title
5 shall be expended for additional costs involved in expedit-
6 ing construction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense,
7 or his designee for the purpose, shall establish a reasonable
8 completion date for each project, taking into consideration
9 the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal
10 conditions affecting the construction and the application of
11 economical construction practices.

12 SEC. 804. No part of the funds made available by this
13 or any other Act of the present Congress shall be used for
14 the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery,
15 laundry, or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its
16 Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of De-
17 fense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons there-
18 for, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are
19 not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates.

20 SEC. 805. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall
21 be used to expand the facilities of the Department of the Air
22 Force to establish or maintain a separate system for provid-
23 ing such supplies and services as were furnished to the De-
24 partment of the Air Force by the Department of the Army
25 prior to August 1, 1951.

1 SEC. 806 802. This title may be cited as the "Military
2 Public Works Appropriation Act, 1953".

3 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

4 ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

5 CONSTRUCTION

6 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
7 porary or permanent public works, including buildings, facili-
8 ties, appurtenances, and utilities, at stations of the Alaska
9 Communication System, as authorized by the Act of June
10 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), and the Act of October 27,
11 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136
12 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of
13 passenger motor vehicles; \$1,400,000, to remain available
14 until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
15 not be available for construction of family quarters at (1) an
16 average cost in excess of \$26,500 for construction, including
17 but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone,
18 architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies;
19 nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of \$5,000, for site
20 development and outside utilities, including architectural and
21 engineering services therefor and all contingencies: *Pro-*
22 *vided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the funds herein made
23 available shall be available for painting the exterior of the
24 Jesse Lee Children's Home at Seward, Alaska.

1

CHAPTER X

2

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

3

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

4

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

5

RIVERS AND HARBORS

6

Rivers and harbors: For an additional amount for
“Rivers and harbors”, including the objects specified under
this head in the “Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953”,
\$5,000, to remain available until expended.

10

FLOOD CONTROL

11

Of the funds available for the Garrison Dam and Reser-
voir project on the Missouri River, not more than \$450,000
shall be available, until expended, for the planning, construc-
tion, and furnishing by the Corps of Engineers of adequate
elementary and high-school facilities in the new combined
municipality (commonly referred to as Newtown) in North
Dakota, which is for the acquisition of and to replace the
school facilities in the villages of Sanish and Van Hook,
North Dakota, which are located within areas acquired by
the United States because of the construction of the Gar-
rison Dam and Reservoir project on said river, conditional
upon Newtown School District Number 1, Mountrail
County, North Dakota, wherein such new combined munici-
pality is located, contributing to the cost of such planning,
construction, and furnishing the maximum amount of money

1 *which can be provided through a bond issue within the gen-*
2 *eral debt limitation permitted by law for such school district.*

3 CHAPTER ~~IX~~ XI

4 MUTUAL SECURITY

5 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

6 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

7 GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

8 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
9 meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States
10 in connection with the government or occupation of certain
11 foreign areas (except Germany, Japan and Austria), in-
12 cluding, subject to such authorizations and limitations as
13 may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency
14 concerned, tuition, travel expenses, and fees incident to
15 instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such
16 persons as may be required to carry out the pro-
17 visions of this appropriation; travel expenses and
18 transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of
19 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at
20 rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals *not to*
21 *exceed ten in number*; translation rights, photographic work,
22 education exhibits, and dissemination of information, includ-
23 ing preview and review expenses incident thereto; hire of
24 passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; repair and mainte-

1 nance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; not
2 to exceed \$2,000 for contingencies for the United States
3 commanders, commissioners, or other administrators of for-
4 eign areas, to be expended in their respective discretions;
5 such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such
6 areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or
7 unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished;
8 and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be
9 essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation;
10 \$11,000,000, of which not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be
11 available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the gen-
12 eral provisions of the Appropriation Act for the current fiscal
13 year for the military functions of the Department of the Army
14 shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from
15 this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from
16 this appropriation may be made outside continental United
17 States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without
18 regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised
19 Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or
20 provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a
21 citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That ex-
22 penditures from this appropriation may be made, when
23 necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sec-
24 tion 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed
25 Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151-161):

1 *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made here-
2 under for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in such
3 occupied areas in such manner as to be consistent with the
4 general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948,
5 as amended, and in the manner authorized by section 111
6 (b) (1) thereof: *Provided further*, That funds appropri-
7 ated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termina-
8 tion of occupation by the United States, of any area for
9 which such funds are made available, may be expended by
10 the President for the procurement of such commodities and
11 technical services, and commodities procured from funds
12 herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief
13 in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior
14 to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized
15 by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the mainte-
16 nance of the political and economic stability of such areas:
17 *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made
18 available, an agreement shall be entered into between the
19 United States and the recognized government or authority
20 with respect to such area containing such undertakings by
21 such government or authority as the President may deter-
22 mine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of
23 such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided*
24 *further*, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include
25 requirements and undertakings corresponding to the re-

1 quirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and
2 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, ap-
3 proved December 17, 1947) : *Provided further*, That funds
4 appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable,
5 and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed
6 by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay
7 ocean transportation charges from United States ports,
8 including territorial ports, to ports in the Ryukyus for the
9 movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United
10 States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with
11 and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary
12 Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals re-
13 siding in such areas: *Provided further*, That under the rules
14 and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department
15 or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per
16 pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of
17 food or other general classification of commodities shipped to
18 the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher
19 rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but
20 this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals
21 to individuals: *Provided further*, That the President may
22 transfer to any other department or agency any function or
23 functions provided for under this appropriation, and there
24 shall be transferred to any such department or agency
25 without reimbursement and without regard to the appro-

1 priation from which procured, such property as the Director
2 of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate pri-
3 marily to any function or functions so transferred: *Provided*
4 *further*, That not to exceed \$1,725,000 of the funds appro-
5 priated under this head for the fiscal year 1950, shall remain
6 available until June 30, 1953, for the payment of obliga-
7 tions incurred under contracts executed prior to July 1,
8 1950.

9 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

10 GOVERNMENT IN OCCUPIED AREAS

11 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
12 meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States
13 in Germany and Austria (including those arising under the
14 supreme authority assumed by the United States on June
15 5, 1945, and under contractual arrangements with the
16 Federal Republic of Germany), under such regulations as
17 the Secretary of State may prescribe, including one deputy
18 to the United States chief of mission in Germany at a salary
19 of \$17,500; tuition, travel expenses, health and accident in-
20 surance, fees incident to instruction in the United States or
21 elsewhere, and hospitalization and medical care, including
22 travel of attendants, of such persons as may be required to
23 carry out the provisions of this appropriation; actual expenses
24 of preparing and transporting to their former homes the re-
25 mains of persons who may die away from their homes while

1 participating in activities authorized under this appropriation ;
2 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
3 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) , at rates not in excess of \$50 per
4 diem for individuals; payment of tort claims, in the manner
5 authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended,
6 of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise
7 in foreign countries; expenses for translation and reproduc-
8 tion rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation, and distribu-
9 tion of educational, informational, reorientation, and rehabili-
10 tation materials and equipment for Germany and Austria,
11 including grants; medical and health assistance for the civilian
12 population of Germany and Austria; expenses incident to the
13 operation of schools for American children who are depend-
14 ents of Government personnel; expenses incident to maintain-
15 ing discipline and order (including trial and punishment by
16 courts established by or under authority of the President) ;
17 printing and binding outside continental United States with-
18 out regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44
19 U. S. C. 111) ; purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance
20 of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices
21 abroad; purchase (including one at not to exceed \$3,600 for
22 replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;
23 transportation to Germany or Austria of property donated
24 for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen contin-
25 gencies (not to exceed \$25,000) for the United States

1 chief of mission in Germany, to be accounted for pur-
2 suant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes
3 (31 U. S. C. 107) ; and representation allowances (not to
4 exceed \$35,000) similar to those authorized by section 901
5 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C.
6 1131) ; \$19,000,000: *Provided*, That provisions of law,
7 including current appropriation Acts, applicable to the
8 Department of State shall be available for application to
9 expenditures made from this appropriation: *Provided fur-*
10 *ther*, That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932,
11 as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out
12 the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency
13 may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation:
14 *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation
15 may be made outside the continental United States, when
16 necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sec-
17 tions 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Pro-*
18 *vided further*, That the Department of State is authorized
19 to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation,
20 including unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reim-
21 bursement from this or any other appropriation (1)
22 currencies deposited in Germany by the Federal Re-
23 public of Germany and in Austria by the Republic of
24 Austria in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the
25 Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and

1 which may be made available by the Director for
2 Mutual Security, (2) currencies otherwise deposited in
3 Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany and which be-
4 come available for use of the Government of the United
5 States, its representatives or agencies in Germany, in such
6 quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be
7 determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with
8 the Director for Mutual Security, (3) other currencies de-
9 rived from activities carried on under this appropriation,
10 or in the possession of or under the control of the Depart-
11 ment of State in Germany and Austria, and (4), in the event
12 sufficient currencies are not available from the sources speci-
13 fied in (1), (2), and (3) above, currencies derived from
14 payments by the Federal Republic of Germany and the
15 Republic of Austria to the Government of the United States
16 for surplus property of whatever nature and kind heretofore
17 made available to Germany and Austria, in an amount
18 not to exceed the equivalent of \$25,000,000; however,
19 the foregoing limitation shall not apply to currencies
20 utilized hereunder for United States assistance to Ber-
21 lin: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this
22 appropriation appointments may be made to the Foreign
23 Service Reserve without regard to the four-year limita-
24 tion contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service
25 Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That in the event the

1 President assigns to the Department of State responsi-
2 bilities and obligations of the United States in connection
3 with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas
4 in addition to Germany and Austria, the authorities contained
5 in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of
6 State in connection with such government, occupation, or
7 control of such foreign areas: *Provided further*, That when
8 the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act
9 of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes
10 subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the
11 United States Government serving in Germany and Austria,
12 payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the
13 same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department
14 of the Army serving in Germany and Austria, respectively.

15 TITLE III—MUTUAL SECURITY

16 For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry
17 out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Pub-
18 lic Law 165, approved October 10, 1951), as amended, as
19 follows:

20 Military assistance, title I: For assistance authorized by
21 section 101 (a) (1), \$3,128,224,750; and, in addition, un-
22 expended balances of appropriations heretofore made pur-
23 suant to section 101 (a) (1) of said Act shall remain avail-
24 able through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with
25 this appropriation;

1 Economic and technical assistance, title I: For assistance
2 authorized by section 101 (a) (2), \$1,282,433,000; and,
3 in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore
4 made pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of said Act shall
5 remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be con-
6 solidated with this appropriation;

7 Assistance to Spain: Unexpended balances of appropria-
8 tions for "Assistance to Spain", granted in the Mutual Se-
9 curity Appropriation Act of 1952, shall remain available
10 until June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with funds
11 allocated for assistance to Spain pursuant to section 101 (c)
12 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;

13 Military assistance, title II: For assistance authorized
14 by section 201, \$499,116,500; and in addition, unexpended
15 balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to sec-
16 tion 201 of said Act shall remain available through June 30,
17 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

18 Economic and technical assistance, title II: For assist-
19 ance authorized by section 203, \$50,822,750; and, in addi-
20 tion, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made
21 pursuant to section 203 of said Act (except the amounts
22 allocated or available for the purposes of sections 204 and
23 205 of said Act) shall remain available through June 30,
24 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

25 Palestine refugee assistance, title II: For assistance au-

1 thorized by section 206 for carrying out the purposes of
2 section 204 of said Act, \$60,063,250; and, in addition,
3 unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made avail-
4 able pursuant to section 203 and allocated or otherwise
5 available for the purposes of said section 204 shall remain
6 available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated
7 with this appropriation;

8 Relief and resettlement of refugees entering Israel, title
9 II: For assistance authorized by section 206 for carrying out
10 the purposes of section 205 of said Act, \$70,228,000;

11 Military assistance, title III: For assistance authorized
12 by section 301, \$540,807,500; and, in addition, unexpended
13 balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to sec-
14 tion 301 of said Act shall remain available through June 30,
15 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

16 Economic and technical assistance, title III: (a) For
17 assistance authorized by section 302 (a), to be furnished
18 under the applicable provisions of section 503 of the Mutual
19 Security Act of 1952, \$202,778,250; and, in addition,
20 unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made
21 available pursuant to section 302 of said Act and allocated or
22 otherwise available to the Mutual Security Agency (except
23 unexpended balances of funds allocated for assistance to
24 Burma and Indonesia) shall remain available through June
25 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

1 (b) For assistance authorized by section 302 (a) to be fur-
2 nished under the applicable provisions of the Act for Interna-
3 tional Development, as amended, \$67,793,000; and, in addi-
4 tion, unexpended balances of (1) appropriations heretofore
5 available pursuant to section 302 of said Act and allocated or
6 otherwise available to the Technical Cooperation Administra-
7 tion, and (2) funds allocated for assistance for Burma and
8 Indonesia, shall remain available through June 30, 1953,
9 and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

10 Contributions to United Nations Korean Reconstruction
11 Agency, title III: The unobligated balances of the appro-
12 priations available during the fiscal year 1952 for carrying
13 out section 303 of said Act shall remain available through
14 June 30, 1953;

15 Military assistance, Title IV: For assistance authorized
16 by section 403 to carry out the provisions of section 401 of
17 said Act, \$51,685,750; and, in addition, unexpended bal-
18 ances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said
19 section 401 shall remain available through June 30, 1953,
20 and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

21 Technical assistance, title IV: For assistance authorized
22 by section 403 to carry out the provisions of section 402 of
23 said Act, \$20,329,000; and, in addition, unexpended balances

1 of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said section
2 402 shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and be
3 consolidated with this appropriation;

4 Movement of migrants, title V: For assistance authorized
5 by section 534, \$9,240,500;

6 Ocean freight, voluntary relief packages, title V: For
7 assistance authorized by section 535, \$2,587,500.

8 MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

9 For contributions authorized by section 404 (b) of the
10 Act for International Development, as amended by section
11 10 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, \$9,171,333.

12 CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL 13 CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

14 For contributions authorized by section 12 of the Mutual
15 Security Act of 1952, \$6,666,667.

16 CORPORATION

17 The following corporation is hereby authorized to make
18 such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing
19 authority available to such corporation or agency and in
20 accord with law, and to make such contracts and commit-
21 ments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by
22 section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as
23 amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs

1 set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1953 for such
2 corporation:

3 Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

4 GENERAL PROVISIONS

5 Appropriations in this title for economic or technical
6 assistance and allocations from any appropriations to the
7 Director for Mutual Security, or the Mutual Security Agency,
8 or the Department of State, shall be available, without limi-
9 tation on any authority conferred by the Mutual Security
10 Act of 1951, as amended, or any Act continued in effect
11 thereby, for rents in the District of Columbia; expenses of
12 attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of such
13 appropriations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase
14 of not to exceed two aircraft for use outside the continental
15 limits of the United States and maintenance, operation, and
16 hire of aircraft; purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger
17 motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the
18 United States and, in addition, passenger motor vehicles
19 abroad may be exchanged or sold and replaced for an equal
20 number of such vehicles; transportation of privately owned
21 automobiles; entertainment within the United States (not to
22 exceed \$20,000) ; exchange of funds without regard to sec-
23 tion 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543) ; loss by
24 exchange; expenditures (not to exceed \$50,000) of a con-
25 fidential character other than entertainment provided that a

1 certificate of the amount of each such expenditure, the nature
2 of which it is considered inadvisable to specify, shall be made
3 by the Director or Deputy Director of Mutual Security, and
4 every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for
5 the amount therein specified; insurance of official motor ve-
6 hicles in foreign countries; acquisition of quarters
7 outside the continental limits of the United States to house
8 employees of the United States Government by rental (with-
9 out regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as
10 amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, purchase, or con-
11 struction, and necessary repairs and alterations to such
12 quarters; health and accident insurance for foreign
13 trainees and technicians while en route or absent from
14 their own countries participating in activities author-
15 ized under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;
16 actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former
17 homes in the United States or elsewhere the remains of per-
18 sons or members of the families of persons who may die
19 while such persons are away from their homes participating
20 in activities under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as
21 amended; and services of commissioned officers of the Public
22 Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for
23 the purposes of providing such services the Public Health
24 Service may appoint not to exceed 20 officers in the Regular
25 Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above

1 that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance with
2 section 711 of the Act of July 1, 1944, as amended (42
3 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey may
4 appoint for such purposes not to exceed 20 commissioned
5 officers in addition to those otherwise authorized: *Provided,*
6 That not to exceed \$37,800,000 shall be available
7 for administrative expenses of the departments and
8 agencies concerned with the administration of the programs
9 provided for herein, *including not to exceed \$186,900 for*
10 *salaries and expenses for operating a publicity office in the*
11 *District of Columbia,* and no part of such amount shall be
12 used to pay the salary of any civilian employee at a rate
13 greater than that paid by the State Department for com-
14 parable work or services in the same area: *Provided further,*
15 That no part of such funds shall be expended for the pur-
16 chase of agricultural products or products produced from
17 agricultural products not declared to be in short supply, in
18 the United States by the Secretary of Agriculture, at less
19 than the prevailing market price for such commodity within
20 the United States or if obtained from the Commodity Credit
21 Corporation stocks, at less than the support price of such
22 commodity including handling and storage costs.

23 No part of any appropriation made by this Chapter for
24 any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal serv-
25 ices in excess of an amount equal to 85 per centum of the

1 amount requested for personal services for such purpose in
2 budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for
3 the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appro-
4 priation, any part of which is available for the payment of
5 personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an
6 amount equal to 15 per centum of the amount requested in
7 such budget estimates for personal services for such purpose
8 less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between
9 the amount requested for personal services in the budget esti-
10 mates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

11 ~~(b)~~ This section shall not apply to—

12 ~~(1)~~ not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

13 ~~(2)~~ positions filled from within the Mutual Security
14 Agency and related government functions provided for
15 in this Act;

16 ~~(3)~~ offices or positions required by law to be filled
17 by appointment of the President by and with the advice
18 and consent of the Senate:

19 *Provided further*, That subsection ~~(1)~~ of paragraph ~~(b)~~
20 shall operate to accomplish the provisions of paragraph ~~(a)~~;
21 and the said 85 per centum shall not be exceeded at any
22 time during fiscal year 1953: *And provided further*, That
23 each agency shall impound and deposit in the general fund
24 of the Treasury as soon as practicable, but not less frequently
25 than quarterly, an amount equivalent to the savings resulting

1 from the vacant positions which are prohibited from being
2 filled by this section, based on the salaries of the prior
3 incumbents of the positions.

4 This chapter may be cited as the "Mutual Security
5 Appropriation Act, 1953".

6 CHAPTER X XII

7 EMERGENCY AGENCIES

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

9 OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

10 For expenses necessary for the Office of Defense
11 Mobilization, including compensation of the Director of De-
12 fense Mobilization; printing and binding without regard to
13 section 89 of the Act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44
14 U. S. C. 213) ; hire of passenger motor vehicles; reimburse-
15 ment of the General Services Administration for security
16 guard service; not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and
17 extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction
18 of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his
19 determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and
20 expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the pur-
21 poses of this appropriation; ~~\$1,000,000~~ \$1,250,000: *Pro-*
22 *vided*, That contracts under this appropriation for temporary
23 or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the

1 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), may be renewed
2 annually.

3 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

4 DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION

5 For expenses necessary for the Defense Production Ad-
6 ministration, including employment of aliens, reimbursement
7 of General Services Administration for security guard serv-
8 ices, and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
9 the purposes of this appropriation, ~~\$2,750,000~~ \$3,000,000:
10 *Provided*, That transfers (not to exceed 10 per centum)
11 between the appropriations "Salaries and expenses,
12 Defense Production Administration" and "Salaries and ex-
13 penses, Defense Production Activities, Department of Com-
14 merce" may be made by agreement between the Secretary
15 of Commerce and the Administrator of the Defense Produc-
16 tion Administration with approval of the Bureau of the
17 Budget.

18 DEFENSE TRANSPORT ADMINISTRATION

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For expenses necessary for the Defense Transport
21 Administration, including expenses of attendance at meet-
22 ings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation,
23 \$2,200,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be avail-

1 able for not to exceed four contracts for temporary or inter-
2 mittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
3 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), which may be renewed
4 annually.

5 SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary for the Small Defense Plants
8 Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings
9 concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, and pur-
10 chase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor
11 vehicles, ~~\$3,500,000~~ \$4,000,000.

12 REVOLVING FUND

13 For the revolving fund authorized by paragraph (2) of
14 subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act
15 of 1950, as amended, ~~\$3,000,000~~ \$1,500,000.

16 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

17 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

19 ACTIVITIES

20 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
21 enable the Federal Security Agency to carry out its functions
22 under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended,
23 including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
24 the purposes of this appropriation, \$400,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

4 ACTIVITIES

5 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
6 Agriculture to carry out its functions under the Defense
7 Production Act of 1950, as amended, \$2,000,000.

8 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

9 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

11 ACTIVITIES

12 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
13 Commerce to carry out its functions under the Defense
14 Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of pas-
15 senger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; expenses of
16 attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this
17 appropriation; and reimbursement of General Services Ad-
18 ministration for security guard services; \$25,000,000
19 \$32,500,000.

20 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

21 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

23 ACTIVITIES

24 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
25 the Interior to carry out its functions under the Defense

1 Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of pas-
2 senger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; and expenses
3 of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of
4 this appropriation; ~~\$2,500,000~~ \$3,500,000.

5 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

6 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

8 ACTIVITIES

9 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
10 Justice to carry out its functions under the Defense Pro-
11 duction Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of
12 attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this
13 appropriation, \$90,000.

14 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

15 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

17 ACTIVITIES

18 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
19 Labor to carry out its functions under the Defense Produc-
20 tion Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attend-
21 ance at meetings concerned with the purpose of this appro-
22 priation, ~~\$1,750,000~~ \$2,000,000.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Economic Stabilization Agency, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Administrator for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; including expenses of liquidation of those agencies whose operations and functions will expire prior to June 30, 1953; ~~\$57,130,000~~ \$75,000,000: *Provided*, That of this amount \$11,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Rent Stabilization of which \$2,000,000 shall be placed in reserve under the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to be released by the Director of the Budget only on his determination that the workload of the agency so requires: *Provided further, That subparagraph (B) of section 204 (f) (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:*

“(B) In any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which, at a time when

1 *maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and*
 2 *prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of*
 3 *its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popu-*
 4 *lar referendum in accordance with local law) that a sub-*
 5 *stantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which*
 6 *requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such*
 7 *city, town, village, or unincorporated area; and"*

8 *(2) of section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947,*
 9 *as amended, is amended to read as follows:*

10 *"(2) Any incorporated city, town, village, or unin-*
 11 *corporated area of any county which makes the declara-*
 12 *tion specified in paragraph (1) (b) of this subsection*
 13 *shall notify the President in writing of such action*
 14 *promptly after it has been taken."*

15 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

16 For an additional amount for "Emergency operating
 17 expenses", ~~\$5,000,000~~ \$8,000,000; and appropriations
 18 granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be
 19 available only to enable the General Services Administration
 20 to carry out its functions arising out of the Defense Produc-
 21 tion Act of 1950, as amended.

22 FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

23 OPERATIONS

24 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in
 25 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense

1 Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress), including
2 purchase (not to exceed eight) and hire of passenger motor
3 vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
4 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; reimbursement of the
5 Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of em-
6 ployees occupying positions of critical importance from the
7 standpoint of national security; expenses of attendance at
8 meetings concerned with civil defense functions; reimburse-
9 ment of the General Services Administration for security
10 guard services; not to exceed \$9,000 for the purchase
11 of newspapers, periodicals, and teletype news services; and
12 not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary ex-
13 penses to be expended under the direction of the Administra-
14 tor for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determina-
15 tion thereon shall be final and conclusive; ~~\$8,000,000~~
16 *\$20,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 is for warehousing.*

17 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

18 For financial contributions to the States, not otherwise
19 provided for, pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the
20 Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, to be equally matched
21 with State funds, ~~\$29,500,000~~ *\$15,000,000.*

22 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

23 *For procurement of reserve stocks of emergency civil*
24 *defense materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section*

1 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,
2 \$50,000,000.

PROCUREMENT FUND

4 The “Civil Defense Procurement Fund” is continued
5 available without fiscal year limitation.

CHAPTER ~~XI~~ XIII

7 CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

8 For payment of claims for damages as settled and
9 determined by departments and agencies in accord with
10 law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Ac-
11 counting Office, and judgments rendered against the United
12 States by United States district courts and the United States
13 Court of Claims, as set forth in House Document Num-
14 bered 517, and Senate Document Numbered 144 *Docu-*
15 *ments Numbered 154 and 157*, Eighty-second Congress,
16 ~~\$6,489,954~~ \$1,121,563, together with such amounts
17 as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when
18 specified in such judgments or in certain of the settle-
19 ments of the General Accounting Office or provided
20 by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates
21 of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign
22 currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated
23 for shall be paid until it shall have become final and con-
24 clusive against the United States by failure of the parties
25 to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless

1 otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment,
2 payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall
3 not continue for more than thirty days after the date of
4 approval of this Act.

5 CHAPTER ~~XII~~ XIV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

7 SEC. ~~1201~~ 1401. Unless otherwise specifically provided,
8 the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year,
9 in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946
10 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor
11 vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station
12 wagons), is hereby fixed at ~~\$1,400~~ \$1,600, notwithstanding
13 the provisions of section 405 of the Independent Offices
14 Appropriation Act, 1953.

15 SEC. ~~1202~~ 1402. Unless otherwise specified and during
16 the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained
17 in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensa-
18 tion of any officer or employee of the Government of the
19 United States (including any agency the majority of the
20 stock of which is owned by the Government of the United
21 States) whose post of duty is in continental United States
22 unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States,
23 (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the
24 date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizen-
25 ship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen

1 of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person
2 who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided*, That
3 for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such
4 person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the
5 requirements of this section with respect to his status have
6 been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person
7 making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon
8 conviction, shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned
9 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That
10 the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in
11 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
12 *vided further*, That any payment made to any officer or
13 employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be
14 recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This
15 section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the
16 Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the
17 United States in the current defense effort.

18 SEC. ~~1203~~ 1403. Appropriations of the executive depart-
19 ments and independent establishments for the current fiscal
20 year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the
21 activity concerned, are hereby made available for living
22 quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26,
23 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed there-
24 under, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed
25 under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946,

1 in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regula-
2 tions of the President, for all civilian officers and employees
3 of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-
4 tries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made
5 to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions
6 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected
7 hereby.

8 SEC. ~~1204~~ 1404. No part of any appropriation for the
9 current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be
10 paid to any person for the filling of any position for which
11 he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted
12 not to approve the nomination of said person.

13 SEC. ~~1205~~ 1405. No part of any appropriation contained
14 in this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of \$4
15 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United
16 States Code Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased
17 on condition and with the understanding that latest pub-
18 lished cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the
19 date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in
20 excess of \$4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes
21 of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

22 SEC. ~~1206~~ 1406. Funds made available by this or any
23 other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal
24 year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Govern-
25 ment Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C.

1 841) , shall be available, in addition to objects for which such
2 funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Co-
3 lumbia; examination of budgets and estimates of appropria-
4 tions in the field; services in accordance with section 15 of the
5 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and the objects
6 specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be
7 applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise
8 specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Pro-*
9 *vided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as adminis-
10 trative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from
11 other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall
12 be correspondingly reduced.

13 SEC. ~~1207~~ 1407. No part of any funds of or available to
14 any wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for
15 the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the
16 purchase or construction of any office building at the seat
17 of government primarily for occupancy by any department
18 or agency of the United States Government or by any cor-
19 poration owned by the United States Government.

20 SEC. ~~1208~~ 1408. No part of any appropriation contained
21 in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
22 corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the
23 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike
24 against the Government of the United States or who is a
25 member of an organization of Government employees that

1 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
2 United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an or-
3 ganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
4 of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for
5 the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima
6 facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not
7 contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike
8 against the Government of the United States, is not a member
9 of an organization of Government employees that asserts the
10 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
11 or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
12 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
13 Government of the United States by force or violence: *Pro-*
14 *vided further*, That any person who engages in a strike
15 against the Government of the United States or who is a
16 member of an organization of Government employees that
17 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
18 United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an
19 organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Govern-
20 ment of the United States by force or violence and accepts
21 employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any
22 appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall
23 be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not
24 more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year,
25 or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause

1 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
2 provisions of existing law.

3 SEC. ~~1209~~ 1409. No payment shall be made from appro-
4 priations in this Act or any other to any officer on the retired
5 lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine
6 Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and
7 Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period
8 of two years after retirement who for himself or for others
9 is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of
10 or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Depart-
11 ment of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic
12 Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war
13 materials.

14 SEC. ~~1210~~ 1410. Appropriations and funds made avail-
15 able by this or any other Act for salaries, wages, or compen-
16 sation shall also be available for payment of any tax with
17 respect thereto which is imposed on any department, agency,
18 corporation, or other instrumentality of the United States, as
19 an employer, by the provisions of the Social Security Act
20 Amendments of 1950.

21 SEC. ~~1211~~. During the current fiscal year, personnel
22 and appropriations or funds available for salaries and ex-
23 penses to any department, agency, or corporation in the
24 executive branch of the Government, shall be transferred to

1 any defense activity under the jurisdiction of such depart-
2 ment or agency in such numbers or amounts as may be
3 necessary for the discharge of responsibilities relating to
4 the national defense assigned to such department, agency,
5 or corporation by or pursuant to law.

6 SEC. ~~1212~~ 1411. None of the funds provided by this Act
7 shall be used to pay employees at a rate in excess of that paid
8 for comparable work under the regular appropriations pro-
9 vided to the departments and agencies concerned in the
10 regular 1953 appropriation Acts.

11 SEC. ~~1213~~ 1412. During the current fiscal year, the pro-
12 visions of Bureau of the Budget Circular A-45, dated June 3,
13 1952, shall be controlling over the activities of all departments,
14 agencies, and corporations of the Government: *Provided*,
15 That said circular may be amended or changed during such
16 year by the Director of the Budget with the approval of the
17 chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House
18 of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of the
19 Budget shall make a report to Congress not later than Janu-
20 ary 31, 1953, of the operations of this order upon all depart-
21 ments, agencies, and corporations of the Government: *Pro-*
22 *vided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any
23 other law no officer or employee shall be required to occupy
24 any Government-owned quarters unless the head of the agency

1 concerned shall determine that necessary service cannot be
2 rendered or property of the United States cannot be ade-
3 quately protected otherwise.

4 SEC. ~~1214~~ 1413. The appropriations, authorizations, and
5 authority with respect thereto in this Act or any regular
6 annual appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 which
7 has not been enacted into law prior to July 1, 1952, shall
8 be available from and including such date for the purposes
9 respectively provided in such appropriations, authorizations,
10 and authority. All obligations incurred during the period
11 between June 30, 1952, and the date of enactment of
12 this Act or the applicable Act in anticipation of such ap-
13 propriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified
14 and confirmed if in accordance with the respective terms
15 thereof.

16 SEC. ~~1215~~ 1414. Foreign credits owed to or owned by
17 the United States Treasury will not be available for expendi-
18 ture by agencies of the United States after June 30, 1953,
19 except as may be provided for annually in appropriation
20 Acts and provisions for the utilization of such credits for
21 purposes authorized by law are hereby authorized to be
22 included in general appropriation Acts.

1 SEC. ~~1216~~ 1415. This Act may be cited as the “Supple-
2 mental Appropriation Act, 1953”.

Passed the House of Representatives June 27, 1952.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

JUNE 30 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1952

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 2, 1952

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued July 3, 1952

For actions of July 2, 1952

82nd-2nd, No. 118

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Administrative law.....16	Emergency powers.....15	Prices, farm.....37
Administrative services...8	Expenditures.....37	Property.....8,31
Air pollution.....20	Flood control.....24	Reclamation.....7
Appropriations.....1,9,13	Forestry.....19	Research.....5,18
Automobiles.....1	Housing, rural.....10,22	Retirement.....21
Banking.....29	Imports.....32	Tobacco.....6
Buildings and grounds.....5	Irrigation.....27	Travel.....25
Budgeting.....12,13	Labor, farm.....39	Tuna-fish investi- i
Committee assignments....30	Lands, transfer.....4,18	gation.....11
CCC investigation.....3	Leave.....1	Veterans' benefits.....40
Defense production....34,38	Nomination.....10	Veterans' preference....23
Education.....34	Personnel.....21,25;33	Weed control.....17
Electrification....26,28,36	Price maintenance.....2,14	

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference reports on following appropriation bills (ready for President): agricultural, independent offices, Labor-Federal Security. House passed following bills: extending rural housing program 1 year, increasing civil-service retirement, extending Veterans' Preference Act to recent veterans, authorizing air-pollution research, and transferring Ft. Reno lands to Indians. Senate passed price-maintenance bill. Ready for President. House adopted conference report on emergency-powers continuation bill. House committee reported bills authorizing halogeton control and sale of submarginal-land tract. Senate committee reported bills to adjust burley tobacco quotas and authorize consolidated insect-research laboratory. Senate committee submitted CCC investigation report.

SENATE

~~1. APPROPRIATIONS: Both Houses agreed to the conference reports on the following bills and acted on amendments in disagreement (these bills will now be sent to the President):~~

~~Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 7314 (pp. 9014-6, 9159-60).~~

~~Attached to this Digest is a statement on this bill as sent to the President.~~

~~Independent offices appropriation bill, H. R. 7072 (pp. 9019-28, 9161-3). As sent to the President, this bill restores the Thomas leave rider but adds a provision to the effect that the rider shall not be applicable to annual leave accumulated prior to Jan. 1, 1952. Sen. Robertson inserted a statement by Sen. Byrd objecting to the rider. The bill also fixes a ceiling of \$1,600 on the price which may be paid for automobiles, with certain exceptions. The conferees compromised the National Science Foundation item at \$4,750,000.~~

~~Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, H. R. 7151 (pp. 9016-9, 9160).~~

~~D. C. appropriation bill, H. R. 7216 (pp. 9010-3, 9160).~~

~~2. PRICE MAINTENANCE. Passed, 64-16, without amendment H. R. 5767, to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to extend the provisions of State "fair-trade"~~

laws, relating to minimum or stipulated resale prices, to merchants not signing such agreements with wholesalers or distributors (pp. 9068, 9073-112, 9118-27, 9135-45). This bill will now be sent to the President.

3. CCC INVESTIGATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee submitted its report on its investigation of CCC storage and processing activities (S. Rept. 2048)(p. 9064). The report is not yet printed, and the committee staff informs us that it may not be available for distribution for several weeks.
4. LAND TRANSFER. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5055, to authorize exchange of certain lands in Ontonagon County, Mich., for lands within the Ottawa National Forest (S. Rept. 2053)(p. 9064).
5. INSECT RESEARCH. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7952, to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect and the Citrus Insect Laboratories of E&PQ located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to authorize new quarters (S. Rept. 2054)(p. 9064).
6. TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8170, to authorize reductions in minimum burley tobacco farm acreage allotments (S. Rept. 2055)(p. 9064).
7. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. 2320, to provide the basis for authorizing irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam and to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues (S. Rept. 2051)(p. 9064).
8. PROPERTY; ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 5350, to make various amendments to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (S. Rept. 2075)(p. 9064).
9. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. The Appropriations Committee was authorized to report this bill, H. R. 8370, during recess (p. 9148).
10. NOMINATION of Walter L. Green, to be Federal Housing Commissioner, was confirmed (pp. 9158, 9168).
11. TUNA-FISH INVESTIGATION. Sen. George inserted a Tariff Commission public notice on the investigation of the domestic tuna-fish industry undertaken by that agency on June 30 (p. 9068).
12. BUDGETING. Sen. McClellan inserted a Washington Post editorial favoring S. 913 and H. R. 7888, to create a joint budget committee, etc. (p. 9072).

HOUSE

13. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 493, allowing \$500,000 to the Appropriations Committee for staff aid in scrutinizing the budget and in investigating the expenses of the executive agencies (H. Rept. 2429)(pp. 9059, 9001-2, A4431).
14. PRICE MAINTENANCE. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. 917, establishing good faith as a defense to a charge of price discrimination to meet the equally low price of a competitor (H. Rept. 2438)(p. 9059).
15. EMERGENCY POWERS. Agreed to the conference report on H. J. Res. 477, to continue certain statutory provisions during the emergency and for 6 months

Approval date	Name and address	Chief counsel, commissioner, secretary	Tax due	Compromise settlement	Years involved
May 26, 1950	Josselson Bros., Inc., Ashland, Ky. Transferees of Josselson Bros., Inc.: Alex Josselson, Sara Josselson, 2711 Seminole Ave., Ashland, Ky. Alex and Sara Josselson, address as above, transferees of Alex and Sara Josselson: Willard and Irma Patrick. Julius Josselson, 2711 Seminole Ave., Ashland, Ky. Annyco Baum, 511 South Serreno Ave., Los Angeles, Calif. Louis and Fern Solomon, 5636 Forbes St., Pittsburgh, Pa. I. A. Johnson, 1840 Winchester Ave., Ashland, Ky.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	\$ 1,427,000.00	\$75,000.00	1943.
May 24, 1951	Kaplin, David J., 168 Keeline Ave., Council Bluffs, Iowa.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	335,271.82	282,078.05	1943-47.
June 23, 1949	Lowe, Walter J., 420 Par Ave., Orlando, Fla. (formerly of Gas City, Ind.).	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	535,406.50	64,000.00	1932-44.
June 23, 1949	Lowe, Nola, 420 Par Ave., Orlando, Fla. (formerly of Gas City, Ind.).	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	888,021.76	1,000.00	1932-36. 1938-44.
Oct. 8, 1946	McCloskey Grant Corp., 20th St. and Indiana Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	549,182.07	100,000.00	1942-43.
Mar. 28, 1950	O'Sullivan Rubber Co. (predecessor), Winchester, Va., and/or O'Sullivan Rubber Corp. (successor), Post Office Box 603, Winchester, Va.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	611,734.16	475,000.00	1943-46.
Sept. 22, 1944	Saven Corp., 3266 Penobscott Bldg., Detroit, Mich.	Wenchel, Nunan, Garth (acting)	2,072,233.52	75,000.00	1928-29.
Nov. 1, 1948	Wilkoif, David L., 2922 Grant Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	376,133.05	267,551.85	1940-41 and 1943-45.
May 24, 1950	Buff, estate of Louis F., care of Calvin P. Bartlett, 53 State St., Boston, Mass.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	478,186.92	99,718.10	1929-41.
May 10, 1949	Greenberg, Leo et ux, 165 Lafayette Ave., Passaic, N. J.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	445,145.23	75,000.00	1943-46.
Sept. 28, 1950	Greenberg, Murray, 160 Irwin St., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oliphant, Martin, Graham	455,756.04	75,000.00	1942-44.
Feb. 16, 1951	Jones, estate of Charles L. Jones, Ersie C., executrix 300 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	597,788.39	87,828.87	1941-42.
Sept. 30, 1948	Kittay Bros., Inc., care of Sam Kittay, president, 43 West 23d St., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Graham	527,923.09	260,000.00	1941-43.
May 4, 1944	Leebove, estate of Isalah J. H. Graham, administrator, D. B. N., care of Virgil W. McClintic, 500 South Main St., Mount Pleasant, Mich.	Wenchel, Nunan, Sullivan	579,213.01	24,500.00	1932-38.
June 2, 1947	The Robinson Foundation, Inc., as taxpayer and as transferee of 8 concerns, 14 Wall St., New York, N. Y.	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	2,250,000.00 ¹ 1,700,000.00	2,000,000.00	To 1946.
June 22, 1945	Steinreich, Kenneth P., 46 Bretton Rd., Scarsdale, N. Y.	do	3,950,000.00		
Nov. 29, 1950	Universal Camera Corp., 28 West 23d St., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	909,813.17	25,000.00	1929-32 and 1935.
Apr. 4, 1950	Wadell Engineering Co., 19 Henry St., Passaic, N. J.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	745,115.55	270,000.00	1950.
Dec. 14, 1945	Wallick, L. C., Broad and High Sts., Columbus, Ohio.	Wenchel, Sherwood, O'Connell	229,797.71	75,000.00	1942-45.
Dec. 4, 1950	White, Cleveland, J., 907 Lathrop Ave., River Forest, Ill.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	377,574.21	10,011.12	1944-46.
July 8, 1947	Harry E. Jacoby, individually and as transferee of assets of Amazon Hose & Rubber Co., 130 North Jefferson St., Chicago, Ill.	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	295,304.70	35,000.00	1937-43.
Jan. 4, 1949	Arch-Bilt Corrugated Products, 51-18 Grand Ave. (corporation), Maspeth, N. Y.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	385,042.54	197,549.25	1942-46.
Jan. 15, 1943	Borg, John, Hackensack, N. J.	Wenchel, Helvering, Sullivan	418,174.28	169,925.00	1941-44.
July 18, 1945	Boyle, estate of William D., care of Roy W. Crimm, executor, 807 Midland Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	609,792.44	525,909.44	1936-37, 1940-42.
Nov. 17, 1948	United Importers & Distributors, Inc., 167 Columbus Ave., New Haven, Conn.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	395,066.69	125,000.00	1929-38.
	Acceptance of this compromise was conditional upon acceptance of the following compromise settlements:	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	687,926.80	135,000.00	1932-38.
	Charles DiAntonio, 614 Ferry St., New Haven, Conn.		909,437.23	431,858.58	1943.
	Alice Gorby DiAntonio, transferee of Charles DiAntonio, 1291 State St., New Haven, Conn.		1,391,005.89	10,000.00	1920-43.
	Jennie DiAntonio, transferee of Charles DiAntonio, 614 Ferry St., New Haven, Conn.		374,788.39	5,000.00	1920-40.
	Anthony Germe, transferee of Charles DiAntonio, 614 Ferry St., New Haven, Conn.		374,788.39	5,000.00	1920-40.
	Michael F. O'Connor and Mary G. O'Connor, 180 Yale Ave., New Haven, Conn.		224,247.52	5,000.00	1920-43.
		Total tax	3,649,055.81		
		Less duplication	867,241.82		
May 3, 1951	Gay, Estate of Norman H., care of Harry Stebbins and Lawrence E. Irell, executor, 810 Roosevelt Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	945,156.76	143,459.81	1942-45.
Sept. 9, 1942	Koch, William, 111 East 56th St., New York, N. Y.	Wenchel, Helvering, Sullivan	² 345,895.35	3,500.00	1928-31.
July 17, 1946	West, James W., MacCrellich & Quigley, Trenton, N. J., care of Humbert B. Powell, 2124 Lincoln-Liberty Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	191,469.22 718,134.99	100,000.00	1926-41.
			909,604.21		
Jan. 15, 1951	Edge Moor Iron Works, Edge Moor, Del., Benard D. Beamish, New Rochelle, N. Y., sole owner.	Oliphant, Fred Martin, Thos. J. Lynch	947,266.83	300,000.00	1943 and 1945.
Dec. 8, 1948	Florence, W. L., Powder Springs, Ga.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	992,597.35	550,000.00	1941-44.
Do	General Desserts Corp., 425 West 13th St., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	1,636,151.49	853,754.86	1942-44.
Oct. 9, 1950	Stadium Yacht Basin, Inc., foot of West 3d St., Cleveland, Ohio.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, John Graham	1,044,550.58	55,000.00	1941-46.
Jan. 16, 1951	Stein Bros. Paper Box Co., 2042 West Carroll Ave., Chicago, Ill.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	585,905.03	375,000.00	1942-45.
Oct. 24, 1950	Stewart & Co., Inc., James, 230 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	622,074.48	178,567.43	1941-42.
May 3, 1948	Custer, Calvin, care of Griswold & Vargas, First National Bank Bldg., Reno, Nev.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Foley	312,373.56	2,000.00	1929 and 1932-38.
June 28, 1949	Epstein, Anna, Epstein, estate of Joseph G., 3221 Milburn St., Houston, Tex.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	1,172,086.32	15,762.78	1943-44.

¹ Approximately.² Does not include penalties or interest.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Appropriations be permitted to report H. R. 8370, the supplemental appropriations bill, after the recess today, if it is not reported before the recess is taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am told that some conference reports will soon be ready. I told several Senators that we would probably not transact any more business today, but it is important to dispose of the conference reports. I have been informed that some Senators desire to address the Senate on other subjects, so if the conference reports are ready by the time the Senators have finished, we will consider some of them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that the conference report on the housing bill, which the Senate passed some time ago, has been agreed to by the House and will be sent to the Senate shortly. It contains two amendments which I believe the Senate will accept. I have talked today with the distinguished minority leader of the Banking and Currency Committee with respect to the amendments.

One was in connection with the situation with which the Senator from New Mexico, was concerned, and another was in connection with FHA insurance for State housing built for veterans. The so-called Fulbright amendment which the House struck from the bill is one which I prefer to see in the bill. I shall discuss it further with the Senator from Arkansas and see what he desires me to do.

I also understand that the conference report on the Independent Offices bill will soon be ready.

Mr. President, I am leaving the Chamber to attend a meeting of the Appropriations Committee. As soon as any conference reports are ready, I trust that I will be immediately notified so that I may be present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order that Senators may know what the order of business will be tomorrow, I should like to make an announcement. In the morning at 9:30 the calendar will be called from beginning. I am hopeful that an appropriation bill will be reported, and that there will be no objection to considering it, and at least trying to dispose of it tomorrow after the call of the calendar. If the appropriation bill is not taken up, I give notice that we may take up the treaties on the calendar, which will probably not require more than an hour.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Do I correctly understand that the call of the calendar, under the unanimous-consent agreement, will proceed without interruption, or will it be broken into by reports which are privileged and other matters?

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope we may finish the call of the calendar. If any matter is of sufficient importance, the call of the calendar can be interrupted to consider it, but I think it is important to go through with the call of the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I am glad to hear the distinguished majority leader make that statement, because it would help considerably in covering as much ground as possible.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I think I should say to the majority leader that in my opinion it will be very difficult to obtain a quorum on Saturday afternoon. I know of many Senators on this side of the aisle who have arranged their passage to the convention.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wonder why they should be doing that. [Laughter.]

Mr. WELKER. We are going out there to mix a little paint, to end the rule of the Senator's party.

Mr. McFARLAND. The paint which the Senator's party has mixed in the past few years has not been very good. It has washed off.

Mr. WELKER. If the Senator wishes to see a good brand of paint, or if he wishes to enter into a political argument, let us take a couple of hours for it. However, I felt that in all fairness to the majority leader I should make the statement which I have made.

Mr. McFARLAND. We are going ahead as rapidly as possible and working as hard as possible. That is the reason why I think we should dispose of conference reports this evening, if possible.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senate be in session on Friday?

Mr. McFARLAND. There will be a session on Friday.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it planned that the Senate shall be in session all day Friday?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senate will be in session Friday. How long the Senate will be in session on Friday will depend to a great extent upon what is accomplished tomorrow.

STEPS TO UNITY

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, history comes full circle. Eleven years ago tomorrow, on July 3, 1941, in one of my few formal speeches in the House of Representatives, I protested the attempts to have the United States link arms with communistic Russia, and I urged that we use our best efforts to have the war called off in Western Europe and let Hitler and Stalin wear each other out.

Yesterday I voted with an overwhelming majority of the Senate to establish peace with the Federal Republic of Ger-

many after a tragic war which I did my best 11 years ago to warn against and to avoid. Today we are spending billions of dollars to restore a balance of power in the world which mistaken leadership did so much to destroy at a terrible and tragic cost to all humanity.

What I said 11 years ago seems now, in retrospect, to be almost prophetic. Because the things I said then do not read so badly today, I wish to read a few excerpts from my speech of 11 years ago.

At that time the President was laying great stress upon the need for national unity. Commenting thereon, I said:

Substantial unity supports production of defense articles for other democracies when they can be spared from what is needed to equip our outlying posts and to train our men in service. Substantial unity supports aid to Britain, but an attempt to link arms with communistic Russia does not appeal to the American people. Churchill's quick logic is natural for England. Britain is at war with Germany. Hard pressed, she must welcome aid from any quarter. This turn of events, however, changes the base on which our aid to Britain was pledged.

That turn of events was the declaration of war by Germany against Russia.

Our aid was to be given to encourage the survival of the Four Freedoms in the earth. Do they flourish more in Russia than in Germany?

Today—

This was the question of July 1941—is there more freedom of religion in Russia, where communism denies the existence of God and abolishes Sunday, than in Germany, where churches are open, even though there may be an attempt to have the pulpits preach honor for the State and pray for the head of the State as almost the head of the church? Is no church better than a State church? Today, is the system of private property overthrown in Germany or in Russia? Today, is the institution of the family more protected in Russia or in Germany?

These questions suggest the difficulties of achieving a national unity based upon all-out aid for Russia. The truth is that between the Third Internationale of Russia and the Horst-Wessel, Germany's song of world conquest, the people of the United States approve neither one. For years we have been told that communism was not an ordinary political party but an international conspiracy, aiming at world revolution.

Our appropriations bills carry riders denying the use of funds to pay the salary of any Government workers who belong to a society advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. Does anyone seriously think that national unity can be achieved on a proposal to send defense articles to go to Communist Russia, whose disciples are denied pay from the funds that furnish the defense articles?

Then I said, 11 years ago:

Personally, I think the march on Moscow will destroy Hitler as it did Napoleon. England will blast his bases. Peoples he has swallowed will torment him internally. Russia will exhaust his energies before he can use her oil and wheat. We will rejoice, of course, as free people always rejoice in the overthrow of bullies and tyrants, but, Mr. Speaker, any attempt to make heroes out of the "fellow travelers" who have been boring from positions of influence in this Government will produce neither enthusiasm nor unity.

H. R. 8370

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

10 For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Salaries
11 and expenses, Fiscal Service", \$70,000.

1 COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT FUND EXPENSES

2 DISTRICT GOVERNMENT RETIREMENT AND RELIEF FUNDS

3 For an additional amount for "District government re-
4 tirement and relief funds", \$397,000.

5 DISTRICT DEBT SERVICE

6 For reimbursement to the Treasury of the United States
7 for the amount paid to the Pan American Union under the
8 provisions of Public Law 902, approved December 29, 1950,
9 \$54,692.

10 REGULATORY AGENCIES

11 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses for "Office of Administrator of
14 Rent Control", \$125,000, of which not less than \$27,000
15 shall be available for payment of terminal leave only: *Pro-*
16 *vided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon
17 enactment into law of authorizing legislation for the purposes
18 of rent control in the District of Columbia.

19 PUBLIC SCHOOLS

20 OPERATING EXPENSES

21 PUBLIC SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES FUND

22 For crediting to the public school food services fund,
23 in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia
24 Public School Food Services Act (Public Law 159, ap-
25 proved October 8, 1951), \$25,000.

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil Defense, including personal services without reference to the civil service laws as related to recruitment; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$100,000.

REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

For payment of per diem for the fiscal year 1952 of members of the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia, \$5,020: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for the payment of such per diem for services rendered prior to July 1, 1950.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MEDICAL CHARITIES

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "Medical charities", \$92,613.

PUBLIC WORKS

OPERATING EXPENSES, ELECTRICAL DIVISION

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1951, for "Operating expenses, Electrical Division", \$19,341.

(1) CAPITAL OUTLAY, SEWER DIVISION

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay, Sewer Division", to remain available until June 30, 1954, \$1,200,000, including such additional amount as may be

1 *necessary for the preparation of surveys, plans, and speci-*
 2 *fications in connection with the construction of storm-water*
 3 *and relief sewers.*

4 REPAIRS TO OLD BAY LINE PIER

5 For emergency repairs to Old Bay Line pier, Washing-
 6 ton Channel, \$26,700, which amount shall be transferred
 7 to the Department of the Army and be expended under the
 8 direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision
 9 of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until
 10 expended.

11 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

12 The sums appropriated in this Act for the District of
 13 Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for,
 14 be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia,
 15 as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts
 16 for the fiscal years involved.

17 CHAPTER II

18 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

19 (2) SENATE

20 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

21 (3) *Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1953: To*
 22 *enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary ex-*
 23 *penses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the*
 24 *United States, January 20, 1953, in accordance with such*
 25 *program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the*

1 *Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a con-*
 2 *current resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for*
 3 *extra police, \$156,000.*

4 **(4)** *Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery*
 5 *of \$300 for each Senator and the President of the Senate*
 6 *for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress,*
 7 *\$29,100, to remain available for obligation until January*
 8 *2, 1953.*

9 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 **(5)** *Section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of*
 11 *1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:*

12 "JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

13 *"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service*
 14 *committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget*
 15 *(hereinafter in this section called the 'joint committee') and*
 16 *to be composed of fourteen members as follows:*

17 *"(1) Seven Members who are members of the Com-*
 18 *mittee on Appropriations of the Senate, four from the ma-*
 19 *jority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen*
 20 *by such committee; and*

21 *"(2) Seven Members who are members of the Com-*
 22 *mittee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives,*
 23 *four from the majority party and three from the minority*
 24 *party, to be chosen by such committee.*

25 *"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member*

1 of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member
2 of the committee from which he was chosen, except that
3 the members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations
4 of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to
5 the House of Representatives may continue to serve as
6 members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expira-
7 tion of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee
8 shall not affect the power of the remaining members to
9 execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be
10 filled in the same manner as the original selection, except
11 that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or
12 recess of Congress for a period of more than two weeks, the
13 members of the joint committee who are members of the
14 committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a
15 member of such committee to serve until his successor is
16 chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy
17 after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled
18 from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of
19 Representatives, the members of such committee who are
20 continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may
21 designate a person who, immediately prior to such expira-
22 tion, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to
23 the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is
24 chosen by such committee.

25 “(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and

1 vice chairman from among its members at the first regular
2 meeting of each session: *Provided, however, That during*
3 *even years the chairman shall be selected from among the*
4 *members who are Members of the House of Representatives*
5 *and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the*
6 *members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd*
7 *years the chairman shall be selected from among the mem-*
8 *bers who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman*
9 *shall be selected from among the members who are Members*
10 *of the House of Representatives.*

11 “(d) A majority of the Members of each House who
12 are members of the joint committee shall together constitute
13 a quorum for the transaction of business, but a lesser number,
14 as determined by the joint committee, may constitute a sub-
15 committee and be authorized to conduct hearings and make
16 investigations. Any member of a subcommittee so designated
17 shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of any hearing or
18 investigation, but the concurrence of a majority of the mem-
19 bers of such subcommittee shall be necessary before any report
20 or findings may be submitted to the joint committee.

21 “(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

22 “(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating
23 to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States
24 Government, including analytical, investigative, audit,
25 and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the

1 *General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the*
2 *Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government*
3 *Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legis-*
4 *lative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal*
5 *agencies; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropria-*
6 *tions of the House of Representatives and the Committee*
7 *on Appropriations of the Senate with such information*
8 *on items contained in such budget, and the justifications*
9 *submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to*
10 *enable said committees to give adequate consideration*
11 *thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the*
12 *state of the Union and the Economic Report, to consider*
13 *all information relating to estimated revenues, including*
14 *revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury*
15 *and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation,*
16 *to consider essential programs, and to consider changing*
17 *economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appro-*
18 *priations Committees of the House of Representatives*
19 *and the Senate its findings with respect to budget esti-*
20 *mates and revisions in appropriations required to hold*
21 *expenditures to the minimum consistent with the require-*
22 *ments of Government operations and national security;*
23 *“(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing*
24 *committees of the House of Representatives and the*

Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

“(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cut-backs in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

“(4) to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year under way, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

1 “(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof,
2 shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act any-
3 where within or without the District of Columbia whether
4 the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess;
5 to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of wit-
6 nesses and the production of books, papers, and documents;
7 to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and
8 binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems
9 necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appro-
10 priated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signa-
11 ture of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and
12 shall be served by any person designated by them. The pro-
13 visions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised
14 Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194) shall apply in the
15 case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena
16 or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

17 “(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an
18 associate staff director, and such other professional, technical,
19 clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as
20 may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint com-
21 mittee. Such employees shall be employed without regard
22 to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be
23 fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as
24 amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and re-
25 sponsible to the members of the party of which the chairman

1 of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff
2 director shall be appointed by and be responsible to the mem-
3 bers of the opposition party. No person shall be employed
4 by the joint committee unless the members appointing him
5 have favorably considered the data with respect to him sub-
6 mitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a
7 thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

8 “(h) The joint committee shall make available mem-
9 bers of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on
10 Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the
11 Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the
12 periods when appropriation bills are pending.

13 “(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint
14 committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or
15 vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal
16 books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the
17 United States Government within or without the District
18 of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations
19 incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the
20 President.

21 “(j) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of
22 the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Ap-
23 propriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate,
24 or any subcommittee thereof, be assigned to attend executive
25 sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Com-

1 mittees and to explain the content and basis of proposed
2 appropriations.

3 “(k) When used in this section, the term ‘agency’ means
4 any executive department, commission, council, independent
5 establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, divi-
6 sion, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other
7 establishment, in the executive branch of the Government.
8 Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United
9 States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any
10 and all parts of the municipal government of the District of
11 Columbia except the courts thereof.

12 “(l) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
13 such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of
14 this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint
15 committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate
16 upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.”

17 SEC 2. Effective at the beginning of the first regular
18 session of the Eighty-third Congress, section 133 of the
19 Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is
20 amended by adding at the end thereof the following new
21 subsection:

22 “(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing ap-
23 propriations reported from committees of the Senate or the
24 House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports
25 in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included

1 in each such report or in an accompanying document an esti-
2 mate from the department or other agency of the legislative,
3 executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily
4 concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation
5 proposed in such bill or resolution over the first five-year
6 period of its operation or over the period of its operation if
7 such legislation will be effective for less than five years.

8 “(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies
9 under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to
10 the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when
11 practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying
12 documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

13 “(3) The Appropriations Committees of both Houses
14 shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semi-
15 annually shall print those compilations (together with any
16 comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information
17 of the Congress.”

18 SEC. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization
19 Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end
20 thereof the following new subsection:

21 “(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized
22 to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees
23 on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the
24 Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings
25 shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of

1 subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional com-
 2 mittee hearings, and shall not affect the independence of com-
 3 mittee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such
 4 joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on
 5 Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof,
 6 of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the
 7 hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the
 8 Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the
 9 appropriate subcommittee thereof.”

10 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

11 Stationery (revolving fund) : For an additional amount
 12 for “Stationery (revolving fund)”, \$132,200, including an
 13 additional stationery allowance of \$300 for each Repre-
 14 sentative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from
 15 Puerto Rico, for the second session of the Eighty-second
 16 Congress, to remain available until expended.

17 (6) JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

18 POLICY

19 For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on
 20 Immigration and Nationality Policy, including the objects
 21 specified in title IV of Public Law 414, Eighty-second Con-
 22 gress, \$75,000, of which one-half shall be available for
 23 payment from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half
 24 shall be available for payment from the contingent fund of
 25 the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the

1 *chairman of such committee or by any member of such com-*
 2 *mittee duly authorized by the chairman.*

3 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

4 For an additional amount for "House Office Buildings":
 5 \$48,750.

6 House Restaurants: For structural and mechanical
 7 changes, labor, materials, equipment, and all other necessary
 8 items to provide facilities for carry-out food service in the
 9 New and Old House Office Buildings, to be operated as part of
 10 the House of Representatives restaurants, \$23,000.

11 CHAPTER III

12 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

13 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

14 CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

15 For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Air-
 16 port Act", \$585,536, as follows: Travis Field, Savannah,
 17 Georgia, \$51,797; Municipal Airport, Hutchinson, Kansas,
 18 \$43,961; Salisbury-Wicomico Airport, Salisbury, Maryland,
 19 \$25,096; Holman Field, St. Paul, Minnesota, \$174,327;
 20 Municipal Airport, Dayton, Ohio, \$289,294; Kitsap County
 21 Airport, Kitsap, Washington, \$1,061.

22 (7) *For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Air-*
 23 *port Act", \$1,235,887, to remain available until June 30,*
 24 *1953, as follows: Municipal Airport, Tulsa, Oklahoma,*
 25 *\$111,106; Orange County Airport, Orange County, Cali-*

1 *for*nia, \$53,604; *Bakersfield-Kern County Airport Number*
 2 *1, Kern County (Bakersfield), California, \$45,719; Munic-*
 3 *ipal Airport, Bainbridge, Georgia, \$54,196; Municipal Air-*
 4 *port, Cleveland, Ohio, \$347,605; Municipal Airport, Bev-*
 5 *erly, Massachusetts, \$40,258; Municipal Airport, Orlando,*
 6 *Florida, \$246,618; Municipal Airport, Fort Wayne, In-*
 7 *diana, \$198,896; Municipal Airport, New Bedford, Massa-*
 8 *chusetts, \$30,580; Lambert-Saint Louis Municipal Airport,*
 9 *Saint Louis, Missouri, \$25,409; Municipal Airport, Grand*
 10 *Island, Nebraska, \$71,617; Cape May County Airport,*
 11 *Cape May County, New Jersey, \$10,279.*

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

EMERGENCY FACILITIES, RADIATION PHYSICS LABORATORY

14 For expenses necessary for construction of a Radium
 15 Laboratory and an annex to the Betatron Building,
 16 \$131,000.

CHAPTER IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

21 For an additional amount for "Operating expenses",
 22 ~~(8)\$4,500,000~~ \$5,200,000.

1 ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

2 For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction,
3 and improvements", \$5,000,000, to remain available until
4 expended.

5 RETIRED PAY

6 For an additional amount for "Retired pay", ~~(9)\$600,-~~
7 ~~000~~ \$625,000.

8 RESERVE TRAINING

9 For an additional amount for "Reserve training",
10 \$100,000.

11 GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

12 RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

13 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

14 Not to exceed ~~(10)\$14,500,000~~ \$16,000,000 to be com-
15 puted on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Reconstruction
16 Finance Corporation shall be available during the current
17 fiscal year for its administrative expenses, including hire of
18 passenger motor vehicles; and use of the services and facilities
19 of the Federal Reserve banks: *Provided*, That as used herein
20 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to in-
21 clude all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract

1 or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the pur-
2 chase of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices:
3 *Provided further*, That the limiting amount heretofore stated
4 for administrative expenses shall be increased by an amount
5 which does not exceed the aggregate cost of salaries, wages,
6 travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside the
7 continental United States; the expenses of services per-
8 formed on a contract or fee basis in connection with termi-
9 nation of contracts or in the performance of legal services;
10 and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other
11 Government agencies: *Provided further*, That the distribu-
12 tion of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Cor-
13 poration shall be made in accordance with generally recog-
14 nized accounting principles and practices.

15 CHAPTER V

16 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

17 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

18 Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount
19 which may be expended for one passenger motor vehicle
20 (for replacement only) carried under this head in the
21 Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby
22 increased from “\$3,000” to “\$5,000”.

1 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

2 GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

3 AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

4 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for
5 unemployment compensation and employment service admin-
6 istration", \$6,800,000.

7 MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses, not otherwise pro-
9 vided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Depart-
10 ment of Labor under the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public
11 Law 78), including temporary employment of persons with-
12 out regard to the civil service laws, \$2,800,000: *Provided*,
13 That the general provisions applicable to the Department
14 of Labor contained in the Labor-Federal Security Approp-
15 riation Act, 1953, shall apply to the funds appropriated
16 herein in the same manner as if this appropriation were a
17 part of that Act.

18 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

19 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

20 EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

21 For an additional amount for "Education of the Blind",
22 \$60,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
\$60,000.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Pay-
ments to school districts", \$11,570,000.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "School construction",
~~(11)~~\$80,000,000 \$60,000,000 to remain available until
expended.

~~(12)~~PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For additional amounts for increased costs of pay and
allowances authorized by Public Law 346, approved May 19,
1952, as follows:

~~(13)~~"Venereal diseases", \$16,500;

~~(14)~~"Tuberculosis", \$23,250;

~~(15)~~"Assistance to States, general", \$37,500;

~~(16)~~"Communicable diseases", \$69,750;

~~(17)~~"Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene",
\$61,500;

~~(18)~~"Disease and sanitation investigations and control,
Territory of Alaska", \$7,500;

~~(19)~~"Salaries and expenses, hospital construction serv-
ices", \$9,000;

(20)“Hospitals and medical care”, \$388,000;

(21)“Foreign quarantine service”, \$15,000;

(22)“National Institutes of Health, operating expenses”,

\$48,750;

(23)“National Cancer Institute”, \$25,500;

(24)“Mental health activities”, \$16,500;

(25)“National Heart Institute”, \$22,500;

(26)“Dental health activities”, \$20,250;

(27)“Retired pay of commissioned officers”, \$36,000;

(28)“Salaries and expenses”, \$20,250.

HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for “Hospitals and medical care” (29)\$~~500,000~~ \$750,000; and this amount shall be exclusively available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE COMMUNITY

FACILITIES AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses, Defense Community Facilities and Services”, \$50,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation “Defense Community Facilities and Services, Federal Security Agency”: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this head shall be obligated after December 31, 1952 except for liquidation of the program.

(30)CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For an additional amount for "Water conservation and utilization projects", \$190,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER (31)~~VI~~ VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

(32)OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of H. R. 6758 (as amended and passed by the Senate and House of Representatives) authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, \$125,000.

(33)NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$525,000, to remain available until expended: ~~Provided~~, That restrictions contained within the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952, limiting the amounts which may be expended from appropriations to the National Park Service for personal services, are hereby waived to the extent necessary to meet the costs of fire suppression and of emergency

1 reconstruction or replacement of facilities damaged or de-
 2 stroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes.

3 (34) *FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE*

4 *INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES*

5 *For an additional amount for "Investigations of re-*
 6 *sources", fiscal year 1953, \$240,000.*

7 (35) *BUREAU OF RECLAMATION*

8 *CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION*

9 *For an additional amount for "Construction and Reha-*
 10 *bilitation" to be used for construction of Minnesota transmis-*
 11 *sion lines, Missouri River Basin project, \$2,913,600.*

12 CHAPTER (36) ~~VII~~ *VIII*

13 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

14 (37) ~~EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT~~

15 ~~EXTRAORDINARY ALTERATIONS AND REPAIRS, EXECUTIVE~~
 16 ~~MANSION~~

17 Not to exceed \$50,000 of funds made available to the
 18 President under the heading "Emergency Fund for the
 19 President, National Defense", contained in the "Independent
 20 Offices Appropriation Act, 1953", shall be available until
 21 June 30, 1954, for extraordinary alterations, repairs, furni-
 22 ture, and furnishings of the Executive Mansion and the
 23 White House Office, to be expended as the President may

1 determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any
2 other Act.

3 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

4 DEDICATION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIALS

5 For expenses necessary for an appropriate dedication
6 of World War II memorials, erected under authority of the
7 Act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 123), to be available
8 for such purposes as the Commission may deem necessary
9 and proper and without regard to the provisions of other
10 laws or regulations relating to the expenditure of public
11 funds (except that this exemption shall not be construed as
12 waiving the requirement for the submission of accounts and
13 vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit), \$30,-
14 000, to be immediately available and to remain available
15 until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That, when in the discretion
16 of the American Battle Monuments Commission it would
17 be in the public interest, personnel and transportation facili-
18 ties of any other Government agency may be furnished by
19 such agency, without reimbursement, to the Commission
20 for the purposes of this appropriation.

21 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

22 Operating expenses: For an additional amount for "Op-
23 erating expenses", including the hire of passenger motor
24 vehicles, ~~(38)\$35,000,000~~, of which \$30,000,000 shall be
25 available only for the weapons program \$141,188,000;

1 *Provided*, That appropriations granted to the Commission
 2 under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available
 3 in amounts not to exceed ~~(39)\$25,064,275~~ \$30,755,526
 4 for expenses of program direction and administration per-
 5 sonnel, and not to exceed ~~(40)\$2,709,350~~ \$3,657,647 for
 6 expenses of travel.

7 ~~(41)~~Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for
 8 "Plant and equipment", including the purchase (not to ex-
 9 ceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor
 10 vehicles, \$1,450,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with
 11 the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the
 12 Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of
 13 the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify
 14 existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for
 15 periods not exceeding twenty-five years, and such contracts
 16 shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon pay-
 17 ment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and
 18 any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to
 19 the Commission shall be available for the payment of such
 20 cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the fore-
 21 going appropriation shall be available for the construction
 22 of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project,
 23 unless funds are available for the completion of such build-
 24 ing, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

1 *Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for*
2 *“plant and equipment”, \$1,450,000,000, of which \$1,355,-*
3 *398,000 is for (i) expenditures during the fiscal year ending*
4 *June 30, 1953, or thereafter under contracts and against*
5 *other obligations in an aggregate amount of \$3,518,800,000*
6 *for the foregoing purposes which the Atomic Energy Com-*
7 *mission is authorized to enter into pursuant to the authority*
8 *of this Act as necessary or appropriate to carry out the*
9 *program as recommended by the National Security Council,*
10 *approved by the President of the United States, and sub-*
11 *mitted to the Congress by the Atomic Energy Commission*
12 *and (ii) settlement and payment of termination claims under*
13 *such contracts if additional appropriations to permit continua-*
14 *tion of performance under such contracts are not hereafter*
15 *made: Provided, That the Commission is authorized without*
16 *regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into*
17 *new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for*
18 *electric utility services for periods not exceeding twenty-five*
19 *years and such contracts shall be subject to termination by*
20 *the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs as pro-*
21 *vided in the contracts, and any appropriation presently or*
22 *hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available*
23 *for the payment of such cancellation costs: Provided further,*
24 *That appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,*
25 *1953, may be used, any other law to the contrary notwith-*

1 *standing, to start new construction projects directly and*
 2 *primarily related to thermonuclear matters.*

3 COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE
 4 MANSION

5 Appropriations available to the "Commission on Reno-
 6 vation of the Executive Mansion", for fiscal year 1952, shall
 7 remain available until September 30, 1952.

8 (42) *FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION*

9 *For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,*
 10 *Federal Trade Commission", \$125,000.*

11 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

12 HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

13 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions
 14 of the Act approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as
 15 amended (65 Stat. 657), authorizing the establishment of a
 16 hospital center in the District of Columbia, including grants
 17 to private agencies for hospital facilities in said District,
 18 \$11,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,*
 19 That the foregoing appropriation shall be the total amount to
 20 be provided by the Federal Government for the completion
 21 of the projects contemplated in connection with such appro-
 22 priation: *Provided further,* That appropriations and con-
 23 tract authorizations heretofore granted under the head of
 24 "Hospital Center, District of Columbia" shall be merged
 25 with and accounted for as a part of this appropriation.

1 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

2 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

3 DEFENSE HOUSING

4 For an additional amount for "Defense housing", includ-
5 ing not to exceed \$1,433,735 for administrative expenses
6 of the Public Housing Administration in connection with
7 construction of housing under such appropriation, \$50,-
8 000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
9 That the funds hereby appropriated shall not be available
10 in excess of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be
11 appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Agency
12 for defense housing by title III of the Defense Housing
13 and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951: *Pro-*
14 *vided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation
15 shall be used for the construction of any project unless funds
16 are available for the completion of such project. (43) ~~No~~
17 ~~part of this appropriation may be used for administrative ex-~~
18 ~~penses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public~~
19 ~~Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long~~
20 ~~as that agency proceeds with any public-housing project~~
21 ~~after such project has been rejected or previous approval~~
22 ~~thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by~~
23 ~~resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing~~
24 ~~body has recognized local liability to reimburse the Federal~~
25 ~~Government for funds, if any, advanced on such project prior~~

1 ~~to such cancellations~~ *No part of this appropriation may be*
 2 *used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any*
 3 *employee within the Public Housing Administration or for*
 4 *any other purpose so long as that agency proceeds with any*
 5 *public-housing project after such project has been rejected*
 6 *or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body*
 7 *of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote*
 8 *and the governing body has tendered the United States full*
 9 *reimbursement of Federal funds advanced on such project*
 10 *prior to such cancellation and a release from all obligations*
 11 *incurred under such project.*

12 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

13 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

14 The amount made available under this head in title III
 15 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, for
 16 administrative expenses of the Federal National Mortgage
 17 Association is increased by \$680,000; and the limitation
 18 under said head on the amount available for expenses of
 19 travel is increased by \$40,800: *Provided*, That this para-
 20 graph shall take effect only upon the enactment into law
 21 of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress.

22 ALASKA HOUSING

23 For an additional amount for "Alaska housing",
 24 \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,

1 That this paragraph shall take effect only upon the enact-
 2 ment into law of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress.

3 SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

4 CAPITAL GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN
 5 REDEVELOPMENT

6 For payment of capital grants as authorized by title I of
 7 the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1453,
 8 1456), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

9 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 The amount made available under this head in title III
 12 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, for
 13 administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administra-
 14 tion is increased by \$1,433,735; and the limitation under
 15 said head on the amount available for expenses of travel is
 16 increased by \$88,000.

17 (44) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

19 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
 20 National Gallery of Art", \$187,500.

21 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

22 For an additional amount for "Tennessee Valley
 23 Authority", including the purchase of not to exceed an ad-
 24 ditional seventy passenger motor vehicles, (45) \$85,000,000
 25 \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended (46): Pro-

1 *vided, That the limitation on travel expenses in the Independ-*
 2 *ent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby increased*
 3 *from \$1,546,550 to \$1,750,000*

4 WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

5 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

6 For an additional amount for "Administrative expenses",
 7 ~~(47)\$100,000~~ \$400,000, to be derived from the war claims
 8 fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of
 9 1948 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948).

10 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

11 MARITIME ACTIVITIES

12 WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION LIQUIDATION

13 The appropriation made available under this head in the
 14 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, shall be avail-
 15 able for the payment of obligations incurred against the work-
 16 ing fund titled "Working fund, Commerce, War Shipping
 17 Administration functions, December 31, 1946".

18 CHAPTER ~~(48)VIII~~ IX

19 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

20 TITLE I—MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

21 ~~(49)~~OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

22 ~~(50)~~MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FOREIGN COUNTRIES

23 *For establishment and development of military installa-*
 24 *tions and facilities in foreign countries as authorized by the*

1 Act of _____, \$140,000,000, to remain
2 available until expended.

3 (51) DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

4 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

5 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
6 porary or permanent public works, military installations,
7 and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the Act of
8 January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress),
9 the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
10 second Congress), and the Act of _____, 1952 (Public
11 Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), without
12 regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as
13 amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and
14 not to exceed \$5,000,000 for advance planning as authorized
15 by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; \$600,-
16 090,000, to remain available until expended. Of total
17 amount appropriated in this paragraph, \$1,980,000 shall
18 be allocated for Camp Crowder, Missouri.

19 (52) DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

20 PUBLIC WORKS

21 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
22 porary or permanent public works, naval installations, and
23 facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the Act of June 16,
24 1948 (62 Stat. 459), the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public
25 Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of September 11,

1 1950 (Public Law 783, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of
 2 January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress),
 3 the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
 4 second Congress), and the Act of——, 1952 (Public Law
 5 —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), seal coating for
 6 airfield pavements at Naval Station, Adak, Alaska; including
 7 not to exceed \$2,500,000 for advance planning as authorized
 8 by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; \$210,000
 9 for the acquisition of facilities as authorized by said Act of
 10 September 11, 1950; furniture for public quarters; personnel
 11 in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services
 12 necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engi-
 13 neering and architectural services as authorized by section 3
 14 of the Act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556); \$386,409,—
 15 840, to remain available until expended.

16 (53) *Naval Supply School, Athens, Georgia, rehabilitation of*
 17 *existing facilities and new construction, \$2,030,000.*

18 (54) DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

19 (55) ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

20 For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment
 21 of temporary or permanent public works, military installa-
 22 tions, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the
 23 Act of March 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 17), the Act of October
 24 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 936), as amended, the Act of June 17,

1 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of
2 January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress),
3 the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
4 second Congress), and the Act of ———, 1952 (Public
5 Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), without
6 regard to sections 1106 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as
7 amended, and the land, and interests therein, may be ac-
8 quired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior
9 to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required
10 by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; not to exceed
11 \$52,620,000 for planning (including advance planning,
12 master planning, and investigational engineering) as au-
13 thorized by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951;
14 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,200,000,000, to
15 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of
16 these funds shall be expended for actual construction of
17 facilities or structures at Grandview Air Terminal, Missouri,
18 until the city of Kansas City, Missouri, has conveyed to the
19 United States Government the fee simple title to all lands
20 required for the base or has given the United States Govern-
21 ment at least a twenty-five year lease to such land on a
22 nominal rental basis.

23 (56)SEC. 802. None of the funds appropriated in this title
24 shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee
25 contract for work where cost estimates exceed \$25,000 to

1 be performed within the continental United States without
2 the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense
3 setting forth the reasons therefor.

4 (57)SEC. 803. None of the funds appropriated in this title
5 shall be expended for additional costs involved in expedit-
6 ing construction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense,
7 or his designee for the purpose, shall establish a reasonable
8 completion date for each project, taking into consideration
9 the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal
10 conditions affecting the construction and the application of
11 economical construction practices.

12 (58)SEC. 804. No part of the funds made available by this
13 or any other Act of the present Congress shall be used for
14 the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery,
15 laundry, or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its
16 Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of De-
17 fense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons there-
18 for, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are
19 not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates.

20 SEC. 805. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall
21 be used to expand the facilities of the Department of the Air
22 Force to establish or maintain a separate system for provid-
23 ing such supplies and services as were furnished to the De-
24 partment of the Air Force by the Department of the Army
25 prior to August 1, 1951.

1 SEC. ~~(59)~~806 802. This title may be cited as the "Mili-
2 tary Public Works Appropriation Act, 1953".

3 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

4 ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

5 CONSTRUCTION

6 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
7 porary or permanent public works, including buildings, facili-
8 ties, appurtenances, and utilities, at stations of the Alaska
9 Communication System, as authorized by the Act of June
10 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), and the Act of October 27,
11 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136
12 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of
13 passenger motor vehicles; \$1,400,000, to remain available
14 until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
15 not be available for construction of family quarters at (1) an
16 average cost in excess of \$26,500 for construction, including
17 but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone,
18 architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies;
19 nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of \$5,000, for site
20 development and outside utilities, including architectural and
21 engineering services therefor and all contingencies~~(60)~~: ~~Pro-~~
22 ~~vided~~, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the funds herein made
23 available shall be available for painting the exterior of the
24 Jesse Lee Children's Home at Seward, Alaska.

(61)CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

(62)DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

(63)CORPS OF ENGINEERS

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Rivers and harbors: For an additional amount for "Rivers and harbors", including the objects specified under this head in the "Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953", \$5,000, to remain available until expended.

(64)FLOOD CONTROL

Of the funds available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, not more than \$450,000 shall be available, until expended, for the planning, construction, and furnishing by the Corps of Engineers of adequate elementary and high-school facilities in the new combined municipality (commonly referred to as Newtown) in North Dakota, which is for the acquisition of and to replace the school facilities in the villages of Sanish and Van Hook, North Dakota, which are located within areas acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on said river, conditional upon Newtown School District Number 1, Mountrail County, North Dakota, wherein such new combined municipality is located, contributing to the cost of such planning,

1 *construction, and furnishing the maximum amount of money*
 2 *which can be provided through a bond issue within the gen-*
 3 *eral debt limitation permitted by law for such school district.*

4 CHAPTER (65)~~IX~~ XI

5 MUTUAL SECURITY

6 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

7 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

8 GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

9 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
 10 meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States
 11 in connection with the government or occupation of certain
 12 foreign areas (except Germany, Japan and Austria), in-
 13 cluding, subject to such authorizations and limitations as
 14 may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency
 15 concerned, tuition, travel expenses, and fees incident to
 16 instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such
 17 persons as may be required to carry out the pro-
 18 visions of this appropriation; travel expenses and
 19 transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of
 20 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at
 21 rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals (66)*not to*
 22 *exceed ten in number*; translation rights, photographic work,
 23 education exhibits, and dissemination of information, includ-
 24 ing preview and review expenses incident thereto; hire of
 25 passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; repair and mainte-

1 nance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; not
2 to exceed \$2,000 for contingencies for the United States
3 commanders, commissioners, or other administrators of for-
4 eign areas, to be expended in their respective discretions;
5 such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such
6 areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or
7 unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished;
8 and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be
9 essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation;
10 \$11,000,000, of which not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be
11 available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the gen-
12 eral provisions of the Appropriation Act for the current fiscal
13 year for the military functions of the Department of the Army
14 shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from
15 this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from
16 this appropriation may be made outside continental United
17 States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without
18 regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised
19 Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or
20 provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a
21 citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That ex-
22 penditures from this appropriation may be made, when
23 necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sec-
24 tion 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed
25 Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151-161):

1 *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made here-
2 under for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in such
3 occupied areas in such manner as to be consistent with the
4 general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948,
5 as amended, and in the manner authorized by section 111
6 (b) (1) thereof: *Provided further*, That funds appropri-
7 ated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termina-
8 tion of occupation by the United States, of any area for
9 which such funds are made available, may be expended by
10 the President for the procurement of such commodities and
11 technical services, and commodities procured from funds
12 herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief
13 in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior
14 to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized
15 by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the mainte-
16 nance of the political and economic stability of such areas:
17 *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made
18 available, an agreement shall be entered into between the
19 United States and the recognized government or authority
20 with respect to such area containing such undertakings by
21 such government or authority as the President may deter-
22 mine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of
23 such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided*
24 *further*, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include
25 requirements and undertakings corresponding to the re-

1 quirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and
2 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, ap-
3 proved December 17, 1947) : *Provided further*, That funds
4 appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable,
5 and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed
6 by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay
7 ocean transportation charges from United States ports,
8 including territorial ports, to ports in the Ryukyus for the
9 movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United
10 States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with
11 and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary
12 Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals re-
13 siding in such areas: *Provided further*, That under the rules
14 and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department
15 or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per
16 pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of
17 food or other general classification of commodities shipped to
18 the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher
19 rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but
20 this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals
21 to individuals: *Provided further*, That the President may
22 transfer to any other department or agency any function or
23 functions provided for under this appropriation, and there
24 shall be transferred to any such department or agency
25 without reimbursement and without regard to the appro-

1 priation from which procured, such property as the Director
2 of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate pri-
3 marily to any function or functions so transferred: *Provided*
4 *further*, That not to exceed \$1,725,000 of the funds appro-
5 priated under this head for the fiscal year 1950, shall remain
6 available until June 30, 1953, for the payment of obliga-
7 tions incurred under contracts executed prior to July 1,
8 1950.

9 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

10 GOVERNMENT IN OCCUPIED AREAS

11 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
12 meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States
13 in Germany and Austria (including those arising under the
14 supreme authority assumed by the United States on June
15 5, 1945, and under contractual arrangements with the
16 Federal Republic of Germany), under such regulations as
17 the Secretary of State may prescribe, including one deputy
18 to the United States chief of mission in Germany at a salary
19 of \$17,500; tuition, travel expenses, health and accident in-
20 surance, fees incident to instruction in the United States or
21 elsewhere, and hospitalization and medical care, including
22 travel of attendants, of such persons as may be required to
23 carry out the provisions of this appropriation; actual expenses
24 of preparing and transporting to their former homes the re-
25 mains of persons who may die away from their homes while

1 participating in activities authorized under this appropriation;
2 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
3 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per
4 diem for individuals; payment of tort claims, in the manner
5 authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended,
6 of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise
7 in foreign countries; expenses for translation and reproduc-
8 tion rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation, and distribu-
9 tion of educational, informational, reorientation, and rehabili-
10 tation materials and equipment for Germany and Austria,
11 including grants; medical and health assistance for the civilian
12 population of Germany and Austria; expenses incident to the
13 operation of schools for American children who are depend-
14 ents of Government personnel; expenses incident to maintain-
15 ing discipline and order (including trial and punishment by
16 courts established by or under authority of the President);
17 printing and binding outside continental United States with-
18 out regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44
19 U. S. C. 111); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance
20 of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices
21 abroad; purchase (including one at not to exceed \$3,600 for
22 replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;
23 transportation to Germany or Austria of property donated
24 for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen contin-
25 gencies (not to exceed \$25,000) for the United States

1 chief of mission in Germany, to be accounted for pur-
2 suant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes
3 (31 U. S. C. 107) ; and representation allowances (not to
4 exceed \$35,000) similar to those authorized by section 901
5 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C.
6 1131) ; \$19,000,000: *Provided*, That provisions of law,
7 including current appropriation Acts, applicable to the
8 Department of State shall be available for application to
9 expenditures made from this appropriation: *Provided fur-*
10 *ther*, That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932,
11 as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out
12 the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency
13 may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation:
14 *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation
15 may be made outside the continental United States, when
16 necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sec-
17 tions 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Pro-*
18 *vided further*, That the Department of State is authorized
19 to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation,
20 including unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reim-
21 bursement from this or any other appropriation (1)
22 currencies deposited in Germany by the Federal Re-
23 public of Germany and in Austria by the Republic of
24 Austria in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the
25 Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and

1 which may be made available by the Director for
2 Mutual Security, (2) currencies otherwise deposited in
3 Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany and which be-
4 come available for use of the Government of the United
5 States, its representatives or agencies in Germany, in such
6 quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be
7 determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with
8 the Director for Mutual Security, (3) other currencies de-
9 rived from activities carried on under this appropriation,
10 or in the possession of or under the control of the Depart-
11 ment of State in Germany and Austria, and (4), in the event
12 sufficient currencies are not available from the sources speci-
13 fied in (1), (2), and (3) above, currencies derived from
14 payments by the Federal Republic of Germany and the
15 Republic of Austria to the Government of the United States
16 for surplus property of whatever nature and kind heretofore
17 made available to Germany and Austria, in an amount
18 not to exceed the equivalent of \$25,000,000; however,
19 the foregoing limitation shall not apply to currencies
20 utilized hereunder for United States assistance to Ber-
21 lin: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this
22 appropriation appointments may be made to the Foreign
23 Service Reserve without regard to the four-year limita-
24 tion contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service
25 Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That in the event the

1 President assigns to the Department of State responsi-
2 bilities and obligations of the United States in connection
3 with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas
4 in addition to Germany and Austria, the authorities contained
5 in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of
6 State in connection with such government, occupation, or
7 control of such foreign areas: *Provided further*, That when
8 the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act
9 of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes
10 subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the
11 United States Government serving in Germany and Austria,
12 payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the
13 same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department
14 of the Army serving in Germany and Austria, respectively.

15 TITLE III—MUTUAL SECURITY

16 For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry
17 out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Pub-
18 lic Law 165, approved October 10, 1951), as amended, as
19 follows:

20 Military assistance, title I: For assistance authorized by
21 section 101 (a) (1), \$3,128,224,750; and, in addition, un-
22 expended balances of appropriations heretofore made pur-
23 suant to section 101 (a) (1) of said Act shall remain avail-
24 able through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with
25 this appropriation;

1 Economic and technical assistance, title I: For assistance
2 authorized by section 101 (a) (2), \$1,282,433,000; and,
3 in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore
4 made pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of said Act shall
5 remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be con-
6 solidated with this appropriation;

7 Assistance to Spain: Unexpended balances of appropria-
8 tions for "Assistance to Spain", granted in the Mutual Se-
9 curity Appropriation Act of 1952, shall remain available
10 until June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with funds
11 allocated for assistance to Spain pursuant to section 101 (c)
12 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;

13 Military assistance, title II: For assistance authorized
14 by section 201, \$499,116,500; and in addition, unexpended
15 balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to sec-
16 tion 201 of said Act shall remain available through June 30,
17 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

18 Economic and technical assistance, title II: For assist-
19 ance authorized by section 203, \$50,822,750; and, in addi-
20 tion, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made
21 pursuant to section 203 of said Act (except the amounts
22 allocated or available for the purposes of sections 204 and
23 205 of said Act) shall remain available through June 30,
24 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

25 Palestine refugee assistance, title II: For assistance au-

1 thorized by section 206 for carrying out the purposes of
2 section 204 of said Act, \$60,063,250; and, in addition,
3 unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made avail-
4 able pursuant to section 203 and allocated or otherwise
5 available for the purposes of said section 204 shall remain
6 available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated
7 with this appropriation;

8 Relief and resettlement of refugees entering Israel, title
9 II: For assistance authorized by section 206 for carrying out
10 the purposes of section 205 of said Act, \$70,228,000;

11 Military assistance, title III: For assistance authorized
12 by section 301, \$540,807,500; and, in addition, unexpended
13 balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to sec-
14 tion 301 of said Act shall remain available through June 30,
15 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

16 Economic and technical assistance, title III: (a) For
17 assistance authorized by section 302 (a), to be furnished
18 under the applicable provisions of section 503 of the Mutual
19 Security Act of 1952, \$202,778,250; and, in addition,
20 unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made
21 available pursuant to section 302 of said Act and allocated or
22 otherwise available to the Mutual Security Agency (except
23 unexpended balances of funds allocated for assistance to
24 Burma and Indonesia) shall remain available through June
25 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

(b) For assistance authorized by section 302 (a) to be furnished under the applicable provisions of the Act for International Development, as amended, \$67,793,000; and, in addition, unexpended balances of (1) appropriations heretofore available pursuant to section 302 of said Act and allocated or otherwise available to the Technical Cooperation Administration, and (2) funds allocated for assistance for Burma and Indonesia, shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Contributions to United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, title III: The unobligated balances of the appropriations available during the fiscal year 1952 for carrying out section 303 of said Act shall remain available through June 30, 1953;

Military assistance, Title IV: For assistance authorized by section 403 to carry out the provisions of section 401 of said Act, \$51,685,750; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said section 401 shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Technical assistance, title IV: For assistance authorized by section 403 to carry out the provisions of section 402 of said Act, \$20,329,000; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said section

1 402 shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and be
2 consolidated with this appropriation;

3 Movement of migrants, title V: For assistance authorized
4 by section 534, \$9,240,500;

5 Ocean freight, voluntary relief packages, title V: For
6 assistance authorized by section 535, \$2,587,500.

7 MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

8 For contributions authorized by section 404 (b) of the
9 Act for International Development, as amended by section
10 10 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, \$9,171,333.

11 CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL

12 CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

13 For contributions authorized by section 12 of the Mutual
14 Security Act of 1952, \$6,666,667.

15 CORPORATION

16 The following corporation is hereby authorized to make
17 such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing
18 authority available to such corporation or agency and in
19 accord with law, and to make such contracts and commit-
20 ments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by
21 section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as
22 amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs
23 set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1953 for such
24 corporation:

25 Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title for economic or technical assistance and allocations from any appropriations to the Director for Mutual Security, or the Mutual Security Agency, or the Department of State, shall be available, without limitation on any authority conferred by the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, or any Act continued in effect thereby, for rents in the District of Columbia; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of such appropriations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to exceed two aircraft for use outside the continental limits of the United States and maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft; purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the United States and, in addition, passenger motor vehicles abroad may be exchanged or sold and replaced for an equal number of such vehicles; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed \$20,000) ; exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543) ; loss by exchange; expenditures (not to exceed \$50,000) of a confidential character other than entertainment provided that a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure, the nature of which it is considered inadvisable to specify, shall be made by the Director or Deputy Director of Mutual Security, and

1 every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for
2 the amount therein specified; insurance of official motor ve-
3 hicles in foreign countries; acquisition of quarters
4 outside the continental limits of the United States to house
5 employees of the United States Government by rental (with-
6 out regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as
7 amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, purchase, or con-
8 struction, and necessary repairs and alterations to such
9 quarters; health and accident insurance for foreign
10 trainees and technicians while en route or absent from
11 their own countries participating in activities author-
12 ized under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;
13 actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former
14 homes in the United States or elsewhere the remains of per-
15 sons or members of the families of persons who may die
16 while such persons are away from their homes participating
17 in activities under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as
18 amended; and services of commissioned officers of the Public
19 Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for
20 the purposes of providing such services the Public Health
21 Service may appoint not to exceed 20 officers in the Regular
22 Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above
23 that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance with
24 section 711 of the Act of July 1, 1944, as amended (42
25 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey may

1 appoint for such purposes not to exceed 20 commissioned
2 officers in addition to those otherwise authorized: *Provided*,
3 That not to exceed \$37,800,000 shall be available
4 for administrative expenses of the departments and agencies
5 concerned with the administration of the programs provided
6 for herein(67), including not to exceed \$186,900 for
7 salaries and expenses for operating a publicity office in the
8 District of Columbia, and no part of such amount shall be
9 used to pay the salary of any civilian employee at a rate
10 greater than that paid by the State Department for com-
11 parable work or services in the same area: *Provided further*,
12 That no part of such funds shall be expended for the pur-
13 chase of agricultural products or products produced from
14 agricultural products not declared to be in short supply, in
15 the United States by the Secretary of Agriculture, at less
16 than the prevailing market price for such commodity within
17 the United States or if obtained from the Commodity Credit
18 Corporation stocks, at less than the support price of such
19 commodity including handling and storage costs(68), but
20 nothing in this proviso shall be construed to prevent the opera-
21 tion of export payment programs pursuant to section 32 of
22 the Act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth
23 Congress), as amended, or to prevent the sale at less than
24 the support price, including handling and storage costs, of any
25 commodity from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks which

1 *has substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there*
 2 *is danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage.*
 3 ~~(69)~~ No part of any appropriation made by this Chapter for
 4 any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal serv-
 5 ices in excess of an amount equal to 85 per centum of the
 6 amount requested for personal services for such purpose in
 7 budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for
 8 the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appro-
 9 priation, any part of which is available for the payment of
 10 personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an
 11 amount equal to 15 per centum of the amount requested in
 12 such budget estimates for personal services for such purpose
 13 less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between
 14 the amount requested for personal services in the budget esti-
 15 mates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

16 ~~(b)~~ This section shall not apply to—

17 ~~(1)~~ not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

18 ~~(2)~~ positions filled from within the Mutual Security
 19 Agency and related government functions provided for
 20 in this Act;

21 ~~(3)~~ offices or positions required by law to be filled
 22 by appointment of the President by and with the advice
 23 and consent of the Senate:

1 *Provided further,* That subsection ~~(1)~~ of paragraph ~~(b)~~
2 shall operate to accomplish the provisions of paragraph ~~(a)~~;
3 and the said 85 per centum shall not be exceeded at any
4 time during fiscal year 1953: *And provided further,* That
5 each agency shall impound and deposit in the general fund
6 of the Treasury as soon as practicable, but not less frequently
7 than quarterly, an amount equivalent to the savings resulting
8 from the vacant positions which are prohibited from being
9 filled by this section, based on the salaries of the prior
10 incumbents of the positions.

11 This chapter may be cited as the "Mutual Security
12 Appropriation Act, 1953".

13 CHAPTER ~~(70)~~ *XII*

14 EMERGENCY AGENCIES

15 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

16 OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

17 For expenses necessary for the Office of Defense
18 Mobilization, including compensation of the Director of De-
19 fense Mobilization; printing and binding without regard to
20 section 89 of the Act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44
21 U. S. C. 213) ; hire of passenger motor vehicles; reimburse-
22 ment of the General Services Administration for security
23 guard service; not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and

1 extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction
 2 of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his
 3 determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and
 4 expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the pur-
 5 poses of this appropriation; ~~(71)\$1,000,000~~ \$1,250,000: *Pro-*
 6 *vided*, That contracts under this appropriation for temporary
 7 or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the
 8 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), may be renewed
 9 annually.

10 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

11 DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION

12 For expenses necessary for the Defense Production Ad-
 13 ministration, including employment of aliens, reimbursement
 14 of General Services Administration for security guard serv-
 15 ices, and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
 16 the purposes of this appropriation, ~~(72)\$2,750,000~~ \$3,000,-
 17 000: *Provided*, That transfers (not to exceed 10 per centum)
 18 between the appropriations "Salaries and expenses,
 19 Defense Production Administration" and "Salaries and ex-
 20 penses, Defense Production Activities, Department of Com-
 21 merce" may be made by agreement between the Secretary
 22 of Commerce and the Administrator of the Defense Produc-

tion Administration with approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

DEFENSE TRANSPORT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Defense Transport Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$2,200,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for not to exceed four contracts for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), which may be renewed annually.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Small Defense Plants Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, and purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, ~~(73)\$3,500,000~~ \$4,000,000.

REVOLVING FUND

For the revolving fund authorized by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, ~~(74)\$3,000,000~~ \$1,500,000.

1 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

2 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

4 ACTIVITIES

5 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
6 enable the Federal Security Agency to carry out its functions
7 under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended,
8 including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
9 the purposes of this appropriation, \$400,000.

10 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

11 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

13 ACTIVITIES

14 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
15 Agriculture to carry out its functions under the Defense
16 Production Act of 1950, as amended, \$2,000,000.

17 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

18 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

20 ACTIVITIES

21 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
22 Commerce to carry out its functions under the Defense

1 Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of pas-
 2 senger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; expenses of
 3 attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this
 4 appropriation; and reimbursement of General Services Ad-
 5 ministration for security guard services; ~~(75)\$25,000,000~~
 6 *\$32,500,000.*

7 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

8 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

10 ACTIVITIES

11 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
 12 the Interior to carry out its functions under the Defense
 13 Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of pas-
 14 senger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; and expenses
 15 of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of
 16 this appropriation; ~~(76)\$2,500,000~~ *\$3,500,000.*

17 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

18 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

20 ACTIVITIES

21 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of
 22 Justice to carry out its functions under the Defense Pro-

duction Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$90,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION

ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Labor to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purpose of this appropriation, ~~(77)\$1,750,000~~ \$2,000,000.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Economic Stabilization Agency, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Administrator for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; including expenses of liquidation of those agencies whose operations and functions will expire prior to June 30, 1953; ~~(78)\$57,130,000~~ \$75,000,000: *Provided*, That of this

1 amount \$11,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Rent
2 Stabilization of which \$2,000,000 shall be placed in reserve
3 under the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes,
4 as amended, to be released by the Director of the Budget
5 only on his determination that the workload of the agency
6 so requires (79): *Provided further, That subparagraph (B)*
7 *of section 204 (f) (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947,*
8 *as amended, is amended to read as follows:*

9 “(B) *In any incorporated city, town, village, or*
10 *unincorporated area of any county which, at a time when*
11 *maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and*
12 *prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of*
13 *its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popu-*
14 *lar referendum in accordance with local law) that a sub-*
15 *stantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which*
16 *requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such*
17 *city, town, village, or unincorporated area; and”*

18 *(2) of section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947,*
19 *as amended, is amended to read as follows:*

20 “(2) *Any incorporated city, town, village, or unin-*
21 *corporated area of any county which makes the declara-*
22 *tion specified in paragraph (1) (b) of this subsection*
23 *shall notify the President in writing of such action*
24 *promptly after it has been taken.”*

1 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

2 For an additional amount for "Emergency operating
3 expenses", ~~(80)\$5,000,000~~ \$8,000,000; and appropriations
4 granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be
5 available only to enable the General Services Administration
6 to carry out its functions arising out of the Defense Produc-
7 tion Act of 1950, as amended.

8 FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

9 OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress), including purchase (not to exceed eight) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of employees occupying positions of critical importance from the standpoint of national security; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; not to exceed \$9,000 for the purchase of newspapers, periodicals, and teletype news services; and not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Administrator for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determina-

tion thereon shall be final and conclusive; ~~(81)~~\$8,000,000
 \$20,000,000 ~~(82)~~, of which \$4,000,000 is for warehousing.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For financial contributions to the States, not otherwise
 provided for, pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the
 Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, to be equally matched
 with State funds, ~~(83)~~\$29,500,000 \$15,000,000.

~~(84)~~EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

For procurement of reserve stocks of emergency civil
 defense materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section
 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,
 \$50,000,000.

PROCUREMENT FUND

The "Civil Defense Procurement Fund" is continued
 available without fiscal year limitation.

CHAPTER ~~(85)~~~~XI~~ XIII

CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and
 determined by departments and agencies in accord with
 law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Ac-
 counting Office, and judgments rendered against the United
 States by United States district courts and the United States
 Court of Claims, as set forth in House Document Num-
 bered 517, and Senate ~~(86)~~Document Numbered 144 *Docu-*
ments Numbered 154 and 157, Eighty-second Congress,

1 ~~(87)~~\$6,489,954 \$1,121,563, together with such amounts
 2 as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when
 3 specified in such judgments or in certain of the settle-
 4 ments of the General Accounting Office or provided
 5 by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates
 6 of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign
 7 currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated
 8 for shall be paid until it shall have become final and con-
 9 clusive against the United States by failure of the parties
 10 to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless
 11 otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment,
 12 payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall
 13 not continue for more than thirty days after the date of
 14 approval of this Act.

15 CHAPTER ~~(88)~~~~XII~~ XIV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

16 DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

17 SEC. ~~(89)~~~~1201~~ 1401. Unless otherwise specifically pro-
 18 vided, the maximum amount allowable during the current
 19 fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August
 20 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger
 21 motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station
 22 wagons), is hereby fixed at ~~(90)~~\$1,400 \$1,600~~(91)~~, not-
 23 withstanding the provisions of section 405 of the Independent
 24 Offices Appropriation Act, 1953.

25 SEC. ~~(92)~~~~1202~~ 1402. Unless otherwise specified and

1 during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation
2 contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the
3 compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of
4 the United States (including any agency the majority of the
5 stock of which is owned by the Government of the United
6 States) whose post of duty is in continental United States
7 unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States,
8 (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the
9 date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizen-
10 ship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen
11 of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person
12 who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided*, That
13 for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such
14 person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the
15 requirements of this section with respect to his status have
16 been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person
17 making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon
18 conviction, shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned
19 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That
20 the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in
21 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Pro-*
22 *vided further*, That any payment made to any officer or
23 employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be
24 recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This
25 section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the

1 Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the
2 United States in the current defense effort.

3 SEC. ~~(93)~~~~1203~~ 1403. Appropriations of the executive
4 departments and independent establishments for the current
5 fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses
6 of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for living
7 quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26,
8 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed there-
9 under, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed
10 under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946,
11 in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regula-
12 tions of the President, for all civilian officers and employees
13 of the Government permanently stationed in foreign coun-
14 tries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made
15 to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions
16 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected
17 hereby.

18 SEC. ~~(94)~~~~1204~~ 1404. No part of any appropriation for
19 the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall
20 be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which
21 he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted
22 not to approve the nomination of said person.

23 SEC. ~~(95)~~~~1205~~ 1405. No part of any appropriation con-
24 tained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess
25 of \$4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the

1 United States Code Annotated, and such volumes shall be
2 purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest
3 published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the
4 date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in
5 excess of \$4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes
6 of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

7 SEC. ~~(96)~~~~1206~~ 1406. Funds made available by this or
8 any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal
9 year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Govern-
10 ment Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C.
11 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such
12 funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Co-
13 lumbia; examination of budgets and estimates of appropria-
14 tions in the field; services in accordance with section 15 of the
15 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and the objects
16 specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be
17 applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise
18 specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Pro-*
19 *vided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as adminis-
20 trative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from
21 other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall
22 be correspondingly reduced.

23 SEC. ~~(97)~~~~1207~~ 1407. No part of any funds of or avail-
24 able to any wholly owned Government corporation shall be
25 used for the purchase or construction, or in making loans for

1 the purchase or construction of any office building at the seat
2 of government primarily for occupancy by any department
3 or agency of the United States Government or by any cor-
4 poration owned by the United States Government.

5 SEC. (98) ~~1208~~ 1408. No part of any appropriation con-
6 tained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by
7 any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the
8 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike
9 against the Government of the United States or who is a
10 member of an organization of Government employees that
11 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
12 United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an or-
13 ganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
14 of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for
15 the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima
16 facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not
17 contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike
18 against the Government of the United States, is not a member
19 of an organization of Government employees that asserts the
20 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
21 or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
22 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
23 Government of the United States by force or violence: *Pro-*
24 *vided further*, That any person who engages in a strike
25 against the Government of the United States or who is a

1 member of an organization of Government employees that
2 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
3 United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an
4 organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Govern-
5 ment of the United States by force or violence and accepts
6 employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any
7 appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall
8 be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not
9 more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year,
10 or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause
11 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
12 provisions of existing law.

13 SEC. ~~(99)~~¹²⁰⁹ 1409. No payment shall be made from
14 appropriations in this Act or any other to any officer on the
15 retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular
16 Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard,
17 Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a
18 period of two years after retirement who for himself or for
19 others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale
20 of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Depart-
21 ment of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic
22 Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war
23 materials.

24 SEC. ~~(100)~~¹²¹⁰ 1410. Appropriations and funds made
25 available by this or any other Act for salaries, wages, or com-

1 pensation shall also be available for payment of any tax with
2 respect thereto which is imposed on any department, agency,
3 corporation, or other instrumentality of the United States, as
4 an employer, by the provisions of the Social Security Act
5 Amendments of 1950.

6 ~~(101)~~SEC. ~~1211~~. During the current fiscal year, personnel
7 and appropriations or funds available for salaries and ex-
8 penses to any department, agency, or corporation in the
9 executive branch of the Government, shall be transferred to
10 any defense activity under the jurisdiction of such depart-
11 ment or agency in such numbers or amounts as may be
12 necessary for the discharge of responsibilities relating to
13 the national defense assigned to such department, agency,
14 or corporation by or pursuant to law.

15 SEC. ~~(102)~~~~1212~~ 1411. None of the funds provided by
16 this Act shall be used to pay employees at a rate in excess of
17 that paid for comparable work under the regular appropria-
18 tions provided to the departments and agencies concerned in
19 the regular 1953 appropriation Acts.

20 SEC. ~~(103)~~~~1213~~ 1412. During the current fiscal year, the
21 provisions of Bureau of the Budget Circular A-45, dated
22 June 3, 1952, shall be controlling over the activities of all de-
23 partments, agencies, and corporations of the Government:
24 *Provided*, That said circular may be amended or changed dur-
25 ing such year by the Director of the Budget with the approval

1 of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the
2 House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the Bureau
3 of the Budget shall make a report to Congress not later than
4 January 31, 1953, of the operations of this order upon all de-
5 partments, agencies, and corporations of the Government: *Pro-*
6 *vided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any
7 other law no officer or employee shall be required to occupy
8 any Government-owned quarters unless the head of the agency
9 concerned shall determine that necessary service cannot be
10 rendered or property of the United States cannot be ade-
11 quately protected otherwise.

12 SEC. ~~(104)~~¹²¹⁴ 1413. The appropriations, authoriza-
13 tions, and authority with respect thereto in this Act or any
14 regular annual appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953
15 which has not been enacted into law prior to July 1, 1952,
16 shall be available from and including such date for the pur-
17 poses respectively provided in such appropriations, authoriza-
18 tions, and authority. All obligations incurred during the
19 period between June 30, 1952, and the date of enactment of
20 this Act or the applicable Act in anticipation of such ap-
21 propriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified
22 and confirmed if in accordance with the respective terms
23 thereof.

24 SEC. ~~(105)~~¹²¹⁵ 1414. Foreign credits owed to or owned
25 by the United States Treasury will not be available for ex-

penditure by agencies of the United States after June 30, 1953, except as may be provided for annually in appropriation Acts and provisions for the utilization of such credits for purposes authorized by law are hereby authorized to be included in general appropriation Acts.

6 SEC. (106)~~1216~~ 1415. This Act may be cited as the
7 “Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953”.

Passed the House of Representatives June 27, 1952.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments July 3 (legislative day, June 27), 1952.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary.

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 3, 1952

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued July 7, 1952

For actions of July 3, 4, &
5, 1952

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

82nd-2nd, Nos. 119, 120, and 121

Administrative services.....60	Expenditures.....6, 89, 95, 118, 124, 133	Price control..1, 49, 50, 101
Agricultural commodities.....111	Export control.....55	Price supports2, 7, 47, 76, 88, 106, 128
Air pollution.....91	Fabrics, flammable...23, 72	Property management..28, 60
Appropriations.....35, 37, 51, 54, 55	Farm program.....52, 104	Purchasing.....13
58, 83, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116	Flood control.....36, 45	Reclamation.....1, 17, 35, 62, 79, 96
Banking and currency.....34, 86, 120	Foreign aid.....4, 48, 89, 118, 132	Research..1, 26, 30, 41, 91, 111
Bread.....122	Forestry.....25, 99	Roads.....46
Budgeting..10, 38, 95, 105, 133	Health.....102	School lunch program..14, 61
Buildings.....28	Housing.....3, 57	St. Lawrence waterway..32, 92
Census.....55, 64	Information.....99	Social security..74, 108, 123
Chemicals in food.....109	International Materials...Conference.....55, 119	Soil conservation.....111
Committee name.....39	Investigations.....1, 12, 51	Sugar.....90
Contracts.....126	Labor, farm.....80, 93	Surplus commodities.....1
Cooperatives.....97	Lands, submarginal.....40, 44, 78, 107	Taxation.....124
Cotton.....100, 106	Loans, farm.....3, 18, 88	Tobacco allotments...27, 77
Defense production..111, 119	Minerals.....20	Trade, foreign.....66, 130
Economic growth.....110	Missouri Basin...5, 73, 121	Transportation.....15, 71
Education.....68	Nomination.....8, 87	Veterans' benefits.....24, 42, 63, 80, 134
Electrification.....36, 83, 96, 98, 104, 111, 131	Patents.....67, 70, 85	Water compact.....21, 69
Emergency powers.....29	Payrolling.....43, 59, 84	Water conservation.....1
Employment.....33	Personnel.....6, 9, 11	Water pollution.....31, 81
	16, 19, 22, 24, 53, 56, 65, 70	Weather.....75, 117
	82, 94, 103, 114, 125, 127, 129	Weed control.....41

HIGHLIGHTS: Completed congressional action on: Consolidated insect-research laboratory. Interior appropriation bill. Halogeton research and control bill. Continuation of rural-housing program. Increasing school-lunch allotments for territories and possessions. Authorizing decrease in minimum burley tobacco allotments. Continuing existing price-support levels. Sale of submarginal-land tract in N. Mex. State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill. Increasing civil-service retirement annuities. GI Bill of Rights for veterans of Korea. Both Houses considered conference reports on supplemental appropriation bill. Both Houses received USDA supplemental Missouri Basin report. Sen. Aiken claimed Secretary Brannan drove down farm prices in 1948. Rep. Folk inserted Secretary's statement regarding charge that he drove down farm prices. House rejected bill to create joint budget committee. Rep. McCarthy inserted Secretary Brannan's policy statement on cooperatives.

SENATE - July 3

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 8370 (pp. 9249-54, 9264-97). Senate conferees were appointed (p. 9297). The bill had been reported with amendments by the Appropriations Committee on July 2, during recess (S. Rept. 2076)(p. 9172). The Senate agreed to the following committee amendments:
 - Providing \$190,000 additional for water conservation and utilization projects SCS. (p. 9280).
 - Increasing Economic Stabilization Agency from \$57,130,000 to \$75,000,000 (pp. 9286-7).
 - Striking out the provision that personnel or funds of any agency shall be transferred to the extent necessary to provide for national-defense assignments (p. 9288).

Agreed to additional amendments as follows:

 - By Sen. Holland, to provide that the Whitten amendment shall not prevent the operation of export payment programs under Sec. 32 nor prevent the sale of deteriorated CCC stocks at less than support price (p. 9292). The Whitten amendment was for the purpose of preventing the use of Sec. 32 funds in such a way as to allow cooperating governments to buy from CCC at less than support price and then have the difference made up with Sec. 32 funds.
 - By Sen. Case, for himself and Sen. McFarland, to provide \$125,000 for sea-water research pursuant to H. R. 6758. (pp. 9293-5).
 - By Sen. Thye, for himself and Sen. Humphrey, to appropriate \$2,913,600 for construction of Minn. transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation (pp. 9295-7).

Rejected an amendment by the committee to provide \$500,000 additional for investigations by the House Appropriations Committee. Sen. McClellan claimed that this amendment, which had been requested by the Chairman of the House Committee, was for the purpose of helping to defeat S. 913, the joint budget committee bill, on the House floor. At first the Senate agreed to the amendment but substituted the language of the entire bill, S. 913, for the appropriation item of \$500,000. Later, on reconsideration, the Senate struck out the substitute amendment also. (pp. 9270-3, 9288-90, 9292-3.)
2. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Aiken again charged that Secretary Brannan had caused farm prices to decline during the 1948 campaign. He inserted and criticized the Secretary's recent statement on this matter. (pp. 9254-64.)
3. HOUSING. Agreed to the conference report on S. 3066, the housing bill, which includes a provision extending the rural housing program, administered by this Department, for an additional year (pp. 9299). The House received the report (pp. 9353-4). Senate conferees had been appointed (pp. 9178, 9343.)
4. FOREIGN AID. Received the President's report on lend-lease operations from April through Dec. 1951 (p. 9172). Also received in the House (pp. 9318-9).
5. MISSOURI BASIN. Received from this Department a supplemental report on the Missouri Basin Agricultural Program; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 9172).
6. EX-PENDITURES. Received a Byrd Committee report on personnel employment in the Executive Branch for May 1952 (pp. 9172-6).
7. PRICE SUPPORTS. Received a N. Dak. Farmers Union Local petition favoring 100%-of-parity price supports (p. 9173).

mine the merits of this controversy but should request to be advised of its outcome. It is noteworthy that the much larger expenses incurred by the management of United through the various proceedings have been amply approved, even though in many instances questions as to propriety could be raised as to excessive expenditures for proxy solicitations, and duplication in legal effort, etc. Assuming that proof is made of actual expenditures by Phillips in the amount claimed, and assuming (as seems clear from the record) that these expenses were incurred as a direct consequence of his organization and representation of minority stockholders over an 8-year period, it would be paradoxical if SEC were to deny him relief commensurate with that afforded United's management. Moreover, were relief denied him it would serve as a most discouraging example to minority stockholders who, in other instances, might wish to invest their own money in a bona fide challenge of corporate management. * * *

MINORITY REPRESENTATION ON BOARD OF DIRECTORS

In its June 15, 1951, decision the SEC has declined to accept the recommendation of the minority stockholders that they be assured of a definite representation on the board of directors of the reorganized corporation for purposes of future operations. The basis of the SEC's rejection of the proposal seems to have been their belief that the cumulative voting features of the approved plan would provide adequate assurance of future minority representation. Judging from dispositions made of similar problems in other cases of record, it is a normal precaution that such assurance of future minority representation in corporate elections be guaranteed by the terms of the order of approval by means of a direction that the board of directors include a certain number of minority nominees, or alternatively by provision being made for additional safeguards in the election machinery so as to elect a new board of directors. This further seems to be consonant with the intention of Congress that management cliques should not be allowed to perpetuate themselves in office by control of the proxy machinery. It is difficult to see how, with the proxy machinery of United in permanent control of management, and with the failure of the Investment Company Act of 1940 to reimburse minority stockholders for proxy solicitation expenses, the minority group of United will be afforded a fair and equal opportunity in corporate elections with that of management. The SEC decision on this point coincided with that of the United management, and could be hostile to the future freedom and voice of minority stockholders.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1041) to provide for the eradication and control of Halogeton glomeratus on lands in the United States and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 88) to make a change in the enrollment of S. 2938, to amend the Federal Reserve Act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act 1936, as amended, to further promote

the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2968) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. REES of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. TALLE, and Mr. COLE of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8499) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances of telephone and telegraph accounts on Members of the House of Representatives, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 410¹. An act to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5426. An act relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 5767. An act to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes;

H. R. 7072. An act making appropriations for the Executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7151. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7216. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7314. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8272. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of Georgia, of certain land in said county; and

H. J. Res. 477. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond April 1, 1953.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8370, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with this supplemental appropriation bill, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

How does this Nation stand on civil defense? Do we really need it, or don't we need it? Do we really want it, or don't we want it? Must we have it, or can we get along without it?

I defy anyone to tell me the answers to those questions on the basis of our handling of civil defense to date. With one breath our leaders tell us that we do need civil defense, and need it badly. With the next, we cut the budget request made by the Civil Defense Administrator by 93 percent. At one moment we set up an agency which, by law, is charged with the task of educating the American people in the facts of survival. At another moment we propose to cut the money the agency needs for educational and training purposes to one-third the amount required. While in one frame of mind we order civil defense to stockpile the medical supplies and fire-fighting equipment that would be so desperately needed in time of emergency. In another moment of whimsy we eliminate the budget request for these purposes from the appropriation.

Meanwhile the Pentagon brass and the security officers keep from the American people, and from the Congress, the facts that would give civil defense top priority in every home in the land if they were known to us. Has any Member of the Senate ever seen printed in his home-town paper the names of our target cities that were secretly listed by the military, even before there was such a thing as a Civil Defense Administration? No Senator has seen that list because it has never been released. Why not? We can be sure it is no secret from the Russians. It is a secret only to the Americans who live in those cities. Would any Member of the Senate hesitate one moment to vote the necessary civil-defense money if his constituents knew they lay in the direct path of Russia's global bombers?

I think not. I think civil defense funds would be the first order of business in this Chamber if the facts were known to the folks back home. I think that if the American people knew how many Russians were in the Soviet Civil Defense Corps right now—today—they would jump to the job of signing up to protect their own communities. I don't know how big the Soviet Civil Defense Corps is. It must be sizable if, as I understand, they had 22,000,000 trained workers way back in 1947. I don't know how many

deep shelters the Russians have built, but I know how many we have built. None. And I know how many civil defense, volunteers we have in readiness right this minute. Less than 2,000,000.

I am not an authority on civil defense, mind you, but I know there are not enough burn dressings or penicillin shots in the whole country to take care of the victims of a mass attack on this Nation, or on just a very few big cities in this Nation. I know that even our biggest cities would have about enough equipment and supplies on hand after an A-bomb attack to last 4 hours. Four hours of medical treatment is all the victims would get, gentlemen. After that the suffering wounded would be left to drag on for days and days in their misery, for lack of the basic medicines that would be so badly needed.

Where are the gas masks that would save countless lives if the Russians chose to use nerve gas on our big cities? We haven't any, because the research money is lacking. We don't have home shelter plans, because there are no funds with which to build and test them. We don't have a gas warning system, because the money to set one up is not available. We don't even know the extent of the gas threat, because our leaders will not trust us with information that is common knowledge to everyone but the American people.

For that matter, we don't know the number and power of the A-bombs available to the Russian high command, though there is every reason to believe that our intelligence service could tell us, if it would. We don't know the capabilities of the Russians in germ warfare, that same germ warfare which they accuse us so freely and falsely of using in Korea. Our intelligence people know; our military leaders know; the Russians know. Only the American people are barred from knowing the true extent of the danger that hangs over our heads.

Because they are being kept in a fool's paradise of ignorance, and because not even the Congress has been given the full facts, the neglect of civil defense is becoming a national scandal.

I say it is time to air this whole stupid mess. I do not blame Governor Caldwell for his failure to sell civil defense to the House and the Senate; because I suspect that he has been forbidden to reveal the very truths that would serve him as selling points. I do not even blame the White House for giving lip service rather than real significance to the request for more civil-defense funds. I blame those mysterious master minds in the Pentagon and the security offices who feel, for some ridiculous reason, that the American people cannot face facts or—worse still—cannot be trusted with them.

We cannot fight what we do not know exists. We cannot prepare for things we have never seen or heard about. As a Nation we cannot rally our forces against hints and whispers. We must know and understand that we are in danger, terrible danger. We must be given some inkling of the nature of that danger, and of the directions from which it may come. We must have facts, brutal though they may be, and we must have them at once. That is what we pay these intelligence people to find out for us. But, under the cloak of self-defined secrecy, they hide the things they learn and betray us into indifference, or unreasoning fear.

We only fear the unknown. Once the dangers are known to us, we can face them with confidence. Let's take the wraps off of civil defense and get some real perspective on this problem. Children shouldn't be asked to hide under their desks at school unless their parents know what they are hiding from. Private citizens should not be petitioned to volunteer for some half-understood purpose, giving of their time and energy on

the mere say-so of some official in the Government. I demand that we be told the truth, and that every word of the truth shall be spelled out.

The first truth is that, as of now, and so far as civil-defense protection is concerned, we Americans stand naked in the streets of our target cities.

The appropriations bill reported by the House committee will not provide essential protection for the American people. The committee recommends just enough money to keep civil defense in a lingering state of ineffectiveness.

The Senate and House conferees should kill civil defense, or support it. They should make possible a worth-while program to save lives and industry, or they should stop wasting money and effort.

The people must know what the facts are. Is an informed, organized, and protected public absolutely essential to the winning of the next war, as FCDA insists. Or can the military win without such public support, as indicated by the House Appropriations Committee? There is no need to quibble over words. No one would think of sending an army into the field without weapons—we cannot expect civil defense volunteers to work without tools and equipment.

The unadorned truth is that the House Appropriations Committee failed to recognize the scope of civil defense responsibilities and their necessary co-equal part in the defense program. We do not have the time for a leisurely development of a home-front defense plan. The Nation is confronted with a great and present danger.

The Congress in its supplemental bill approved last May failed to make any provision for the essential functions of civil defense. The bill as now recommended by the House Appropriations Committee carries a token pittance for certain of those functions, nothing for other functions. In no case was enough allowed to accomplish any major civil defense objective.

I note that the House Appropriations Committee does not think the civil defense program is realistic or well coordinated. The contrary is true. Civil Defense has, and submitted to the committee, a sound plan. It needs the money with which to implement that plan. Forty-eight States, three Territories, and more than 1,000,000 volunteers believe the plan is a good one.

We will not persuade 150,000,000 people to learn the facts—nor persuade 15,000,000 needed volunteers to sacrifice time and effort to organize and train themselves, without some congressional encouragement.

The States have appropriated more than \$200,000,000 for civil defense purposes, \$72,000,000 of which is for matching Federal funds in the purchase of needed organizational equipment.

The bill as reported by the House committee permits FCDA to match less than one-fifteenth of State matching funds. One State alone has appropriated nearly 10 times as much for matching purposes as this bill provides for the entire country. We cannot expect the States and the cities to strain their resources and their credulity further if the Congress declines to support sufficiently and adequately the civil defense effort.

In a recent action, the Senate voted billions for Air Force appropriations. That action was taken because most Members of Congress are convinced that there is a realistic threat of war with Communist Russia. By this appropriation action for the military, we are doing our best to bolster our air defenses, and to stave off that war by building strength of arms. Those funds will be used in the active military defense of this Nation if the Kremlin does decide to go to war on a global scale.

By this and other actions, Members of Congress have consistently recognized the

fact that there is a possibility of war, if not a strong probability of war—and that when and if war comes, we must be prepared as best we can throughout our total security program.

Yet, if I read my figures correctly, the House committee recommended a slash of better than 93 percent in the funds requested for the civil defense portion of our national-security effort.

May I remind you again that only recently we voted a total of some \$45,000,000,000 for our active military efforts. Yet, civil defense which started far behind the military in building up its mobilization base and capabilities, and which is less than 2 years old, is today faced with a cut of 93 percent of its requested funds. This comes on top of a severe cut last year of 85 percent.

I hope the Senators recognize that this House committee action virtually puts civil defense out of business as a part of our security effort.

Here is what Gen. Omar Bradley, the respected Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had to say to the Congress on the need for civil defense from a military standpoint, and I quote:

"A competent civil defense organization must be prepared to save lives as well as to restore factories to maximum production and resume communications in the shortest possible time. The military will be unable to direct this effort.

"We must have, then, an organization in being, planned and staffed beforehand to take over in the event of such an emergency. If civil defense does not function effectively, our military defense efforts will be very adversely affected."

It must be apparent to the Senators that the civil defense program which was set up by this Congress in Public Law 920, can hardly be an effective organization in any sense of the word with two severe slashes in its funds.

The report of Mr. CANNON's committee, which is generally commendatory to the FCDA in its language, makes this statement:

"The funds recommended represent continued implementation of the concept of civil defense envisaged by the committee and the Congress in making appropriations for this agency in the past two fiscal years. The continued development of this program together with the proper coordination of the civil-defense programs of the various States should provide a realistic civil-defense plan without the expenditure of large sums of money."

Realizing how many billions we have invested in military defense, and the fact that there is a constant Russian threat to our shores, the least we can do for this agency is to give it the same amount of funds voted last year—\$75,000,000—plus enough to cover its increased responsibilities.

Despite the tremendous responsibilities placed on the FCDA by this Congress in Public Law 920, FCDA has been and will continue to be one of the smallest agencies in Government. Even with the \$75,000,000 which this Congress voted for civil defense last year, it was able to make substantial progress against remarkable odds. It must do more this year. Take medical supplies as an example: Last year this Congress recognized the urgent need for stockpiling of medical supplies when it voted \$50,000,000 to the FCDA for that purpose. Those funds were not voted to FCDA until November of 1951. It was impossible for the agency to proceed before that on procurement of the stockpile items.

Immediately upon receipt of those funds, the agency began working with the Department of Defense to work out a joint procurement program which would be non-competitive within the Government. Despite these handicaps, FCDA was able to

obligate all of the \$50,000,000 which this Congress voted for medical supplies plus some \$8,000,000 which reverted from the medical matching program with the States. FCDA was able to obligate every cent of the money which this Congress voted to get started on this continuing program of building up adequate medical stockpiles in case of attack.

These facts are not evident in the House committee report. Instead, it seems that they have emphasized only the amount which had actually been expended during the fiscal year, which gives a distorted picture of what was actually accomplished. This is fiscal nonsense—and dangerous nonsense at that.

We cannot complain in one breath that civil defense has not done something we wanted done, and in the next breath deny the Administrator the money he needs to do it with. That is not even good politics in a budget-slashing year. I would remind the Senators of a small mistake along that line some years ago when some of us voted against fortifying Guam.

Nothing that happened then could equal the storm that would descend upon us if civil defense was tried in the balance and found wanting for lack of funds denied this agency. For every widow who turned reproachful eyes upon us then, there would be thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of the bereft to call down curses on our heads. The wave of grief that would result might well wreck not only those of us who hold office today, but the very Government itself.

Save money, yes. Cut the budget where it needs cutting. But let's not fool ourselves that we are reducing expenditures by letting our insurance policies lapse. Worse still, let's not shoot the insurance agent, wreck his office, and throw his employees out of work. That is not the road to protection—that is an open invitation to disaster.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep sorrow particularly that the point 4 appropriation for the Asian-Indian program, as carried in this bill, as it is reported to the Senate, is reduced to the size of the appropriation as voted by the House of Representatives.

I do not propose to offer any motion at this time; I prefer, instead, to remember that the authorization still holds, and that at the next session of Congress we can come forward with something better.

At this time I wish to submit, as a part of my remarks, a statement on this particular situation; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FLANDERS
POINT 4 APPROPRIATION FOR INDIA

I am much disturbed about the point 4 appropriation for the Asian-Indian program as it seems to be reduced by the conference report now before us.

I am not alone in thinking that the present conditions in India are such that, if neglected, that great country will slowly drift into Communist control. It is true that the Government is not Communist and that it has in general supported us with its votes in the United Nations. In the recent Assembly, for instance, India voted as the United States did on 38 occasions and differed from the American stand only twice. It seems to me that this is a remarkably good record.

The present danger in that part of the world occupied by Indian and Pakistan does not come from the existing governments. It comes from the infiltration of Communist ideas in two groups of the population. This infiltration is taking place in the colleges and other institutions of learning. Until lately we have been grossly negligent in supplying material explaining the purposes and conditions of the Western World to these Indian students. I referred to this matter some years ago on the Senate floor. Fortunately, conditions have somewhat improved, but the young intelligentsia are still attracted far too strongly by Communist propaganda.

But the real danger here, as it was in China, lies in the villages throughout the countryside. It will be remembered that administration observers and advisers for a long time referred to the Chinese Communist movement for Agrarian reform. The villages were the weak spot in China. They are the weak spot in India today, and the recent elections have shown a disturbing growth of communism.

It is significant that the success of the Communists in the recent Indian elections came from the Provinces of Madras and Hyderabad where famine conditions have been the most serious. Any fight against communism must take this location and this situation into account. The danger spot is in these villages.

It may be necessary for the next 2 or 3 years to provide a supply of food. But this is only a palliative. The real remedy must be more fundamental. The major part of our effort must go to something corresponding to the county agent system in the United States. Such a program of agricultural and village improvement is sponsored already by the Indian government. The purpose is to improve living conditions through combined attack on problems of production, health and illiteracy. American farm experts are already taking an important part. We need to expand that program very greatly.

In particular we should assist in building up the agricultural colleges in the various States of India so as to train native leaders to carry on the spreading of information about improved methods. These colleges will provide a steady flow of trained personnel to man the extension service now being established.

Think what this means to the long-time futures of India. Let me say that throughout, I am referring to the Indian sub-continent, which includes Pakistan. First of all, efficient production of food will help to expand India's food supply. This should prevent famine, reduce hunger, and lessen disease. With the improved practices and inexpensive improvement in equipment, the workers released in the farms can be used in city factories to increase the production of manufactured goods. All this will tend to raise living standards throughout India.

We missed the opportunity to save China. We must not miss that opportunity in India where we can see the same development of communism coming along strongly and rapidly under the guise of agrarian reform. The danger lies in these famine-stricken villages. The remedy lies in making them self-supporting and in encouraging the present move in India itself toward the redistribution of the land.

We must not wait until it is too late. We must not find ourselves having long congressional investigations in the House and Senate to find out who was to blame when India went Communist. It is far better to decide now that we will do what is necessary to keep it from going Communist and then all these investigations will be unnecessary. It is better that the patient should

live on in health than that we should hold an inquest over its contaminated remains.

This Congress, this Senate, and my own Republican Party have delighted in digging over the past to find out who was to blame. May I say here with all the earnestness of which I am capable, that if we do not stand back of this point IV program for India, it will be we ourselves, who are to blame; and in the years to come the investigators will point an accusing finger at those who sit here today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep regret that the Appropriations Committee found it necessary to recommend for mutual security, in the supplemental appropriations bill, 1953, appropriations smaller than the authorization voted this year in the Mutual Security Act of 1953, as passed by the House and the Senate.

The matter was compromised between the House and the Senate in conference, when the differences between the House and the Senate were adjusted. In the conference, we felt that the authorized amount was about the lowest to which we could safely go in dealing with this matter. The over-all authorized figure was \$6,400,000,000.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, first, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill. The question is debatable.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on that motion. But, first, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CORDON. That motion is subject to a point of order at this time, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be, if any Senator raised the point.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, at the moment I intend to raise the point. I first desire to discuss it for a moment.

Mr. President, that bill is composed of estimates of the Bureau of the Budget totaling roughly \$13,000,000,000. The hearings on the bill having consumed less than 2 days, no member of the committee in that period of time, had he alone handled the interrogation, could have become even faintly advised as to the merits of the several appropriation requests. It is a situation that should never exist in any legislative body. It is a situation that need not have existed in the United States Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not wish to represent to the Senate that the House passed this bill a day or two ago, does he? It has just come to the Senate. We have been expecting it for some time, but it has just come to the Senate. The situation is that we must either pass it or not pass it at this session. Unless we pass it today we are

not going to pass it at all during this session.

Mr. CORDON. The factual statement made is correct. I am not raising any question with respect to the action of the Senate committee as such, except this: The Senate committee has been working with a gun at its head, and the gun was placed there by virtue of a leaderless majority that brought this thing into being. I, for one, am getting rather tired of operating in the United States Senate on that basis.

Mr. President, we sat here, substantially on our hands, week after week and month after month, during this session, when these matters could have been attended to, but were not. There is not a Member of this body, there is not a Member of the House of Representatives, who did not know when the session opened, that the purpose would be to adjourn the Congress by midyear. Four years ago, Mr. President, the present minority in the Senate handled a similar situation, and the work was done and we closed up on the 20th day of June. These necessities could have been met. Mr. President, they have not been met, and the RECORD should show clearly why we are in the position in which we find ourselves today. So far as I am concerned, I desire to assist in making that record at this time.

Mr. President, there are however, some practical reasons, of which I believe the Senate must take notice at this time, before that bill comes to the floor. Little as the information the membership of the committee has on the subject, it is all the information that the Senate has. If the membership of the Appropriations Committee cannot be on the floor of the Senate to pay attention to the presentation of this bill, then the bill should not be debated today. I understand that at this time there is a conference in process on the defense bill. That conference will take a good segment of the membership of the Appropriations Committee off the floor. There may be other conferences with respect to which I am not advised. I feel, Mr. President, that the least we could do at this time, in view of the position in which we find ourselves, is to take whatever time may be necessary before bringing up this bill, so that those who have what little information is available may be present on the floor.

I feel, Mr. President, that if any other measure can be presented at this time to the Senate, of sufficient importance to require consideration by this body, it should be taken up now, and that the conferees on the defense appropriation bill should be given an opportunity to finish their work, so they may be on the floor of the Senate when this \$13,000,000,000 appropriation is presented. I want to ask the majority leader, who is in charge of the presentation of the legislative program, whether he has on his calendar other measures which he expects to present to the Senate in addition to the appropriation bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the

Senator from California for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator, if I may preface a question by so doing, that, of course, from now until the hour of adjournment sine die, so far as members of the Appropriations Committee are concerned, they are going to be faced with much the same problem as that described by the Senator. I fully agree with his statement that it is very bad legislative practice for a bill which came from the committee last night—and we did not finish with this bill until about midnight last night, as the distinguished Senator knows—to be called up and to be acted upon at this time. But the conference on the military appropriations bill—and I am one of the conferees on that bill, as are the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire; and we are now on the floor—and then conference on the civil functions bill, on which the able Senator from Oregon is a conferee, I think the problem to which he refers is going to face us continuously. I think there are more members of the Appropriations Committee on the floor now—and I see the Senator from Massachusetts is present—than we shall probably have at any other time during this session. If I thought we would gain anything by adopting the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, I would fully support him; but I am afraid that with the time limit we have upon us, it would be just as well to proceed now with the appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CORDON. I have asked a question of the majority leader. I should like to have the questioned answered now.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I first want to reply to the chastisement and serious accusation made against me about there being a leaderless majority. I have done the best I could to work with both sides in the Senate. I have been in the Senate a little bit longer than has the Senator from Oregon. I have seen at least one more Congress adjourn than has the Senator. I have never yet seen a time when, during the last 2 or 3 days of a session, there was not a rush. It can be said, perhaps, that it is a leaderless majority. There have been times when I have lost control because the majority was so small. I have appreciated greatly the cooperation which has been given me by Members on the other side of the aisle. I have done the best I could. I could talk about the Eightieth Congress to which the Senator referred, and how we stayed all night long, two different nights, to push for a vote in order to have a recess. But all I can say is that the then leader did the best he could, just as I have tried to do.

I do not care to indulge in personalities or to criticize anyone. I do not think that will get us anywhere. I have never been one who has tried to make political speeches on the floor and to chastise Members of the Senate on either side of

the aisle. The only times I have had anything to say, usually, were when I was attacked, as I have just been attacked, and, I think, unjustifiably so. I feel hurt that my good friend from Oregon would make such a charge against me. But that has nothing to do with the affairs of the Senate. It does not make any difference what someone thinks about the junior Senator from Arizona and about the way he conducts business.

It was well pointed out by the distinguished Senator from California that there are more Senators on the floor at this moment than are usually present. I hope the Senator from Oregon will not object, because an objection might very well mean that Congress could not get away on Saturday. I think it is very important that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the bill. We could consider another bill; but the reason for suggesting the consideration of this bill at this time is the desire to expedite the work of the Senate. I have seen many bills called up with no more notice than in this instance. Before the reorganization law, all we had to do was to move to take up an appropriation bill the next day.

I was hoping, Mr. President, that no objection would be made. I think we should make progress. We are not trying to rush anyone. We want to expedite the work of the Senate in order to get through.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I will say to the majority leader that my remarks were not directed at him, personally. He happens to be the head of the majority party in the Senate which controls the legislative program of the Senate. The same party has a majority in the House of Representatives, and that majority controls the legislative program in the House. The two certainly have dismally failed if they have not been in conference throughout the past 6 months in working out a legislative program which could be completed on time.

I do not arrogate to myself any great wisdom, but I suggested to the Appropriations Committee at the beginning of this year that the hearings on appropriation bills on this side go forward coincidentally with the hearings on the House side. That suggestion was not accepted, except to a very slight degree.

I desire to say that while this bill only recently, within the past few days, came to the Senate, it could have come to the Senate weeks and weeks ago. The basic legislation which was necessary could have been brought up and passed. It was not brought up and passed.

So far as the majority leader himself is concerned, he has to work with his policy committee. There is a policy committee on the minority side. What cooperation that could have been extended by the minority I believe has been extended. I do not know of any instance in which it has not been extended. The failure, Mr. President, has been a failure in the creation of a program that could be presented in an orderly way and pushed to a conclusion in the days when the Congress did substantially nothing.

As a result, Mr. President, if we are to adjourn on Saturday night—and there is no obligation to adjourn on Saturday night—we are here compelled, in my opinion, to do a thing that substantially is a fraud on the American people. We are compelled to pass upon appropriations the request for which is over \$13,000,000,000, and the amount recommended is somewhere around \$9,000,000,000. We are asked to consider the bill without knowing anything about the items involved.

That situation should not exist. We have an obligation to the people of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. One of the items is \$8,234,000,000. The amount of \$6,001,000,000 is for foreign aid.

Mr. CORDON. I am familiar with that.

Mr. McKELLAR. We all know about it. It has been debated time and again. Amendment after amendment was agreed to—

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may yield only for a question.

Mr. CORDON. I am aware that approximately \$6,000,000,000 is for the mutual-aid program. It is made up of certain activities, and we are entitled to know what they are, and whether they justify an appropriation of the billions of dollars here requested. We do not know, and the members of the committee, I undertake to say, do not know.

There is included a complete building program for the armed services. The recommendation now is that the program be stricken from this bill. That is because this Congress did not, weeks ago, pass the necessary authorization bill. It should have been done, but it was not done. For that reason the program is stricken. We do not even have a legal authorization for the requests that were made. That is the sort of thing I am on my feet complaining about.

Mr. President, it is seldom indeed that I have risen on the floor to criticize anything. I recognize the fact that we are human and that we have our frailties, and it is a difficult situation with which we are dealing. But when I see the sorry situation in which we are today, I can no longer remain silent about it.

We are mighty close today to acting not as a parliamentary body, but like members of a group engaged in riot. The difference is the difference between order and disorder. I want intelligent action, not action on impulse, and that is what we must use today in this matter.

Mr. President, at least I want the RECORD to show the position I take in the matter. I express the hope now that when another Congress comes in at the beginning of next year, whether it be led by the Democratic Party, or led by the Republican Party, it will at least attempt to do something to correct the very obvious and terribly tragic weaknesses that have been exhibited in this session of Congress—and, Mr. President,

not alone in this session, but in others, as well.

This is a job that calls for all the statesmanship, all the ability, and all the patriotism that all of us collectively have or can have. It is time for us to do something to justify the titles that we hold.

Mr. DWORSHAK and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I desire to commend the senior Senator from Oregon for his frankness and courage in presenting the matter to the Senate at this time. So far as I am concerned, I have been making similar criticisms, not directed to the majority leader, because I think, as a general rule, he has sought constantly to expedite and accelerate the consideration of the business of the Senate. But for weeks and months we coasted along on 3-day or 4-day sessions, letting a log jam of important legislation accumulate for the 2 or 3 end weeks of the entire session.

At this point I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon why the Senate could not recess until September, if necessary, and then reconvene to discharge its constitutional duties. Have we, as representatives in the legislative branch, any right to contend that we should be in session only one-half of the year; that we can adjourn, and permit the executive department, under the Commander in Chief, the President, to carry on without any consultation or without any check by the legislative branch? I can see no reason why we are entitled to have a recess of 6 months. I am human; I do not like to spend my time here during the warm days; but I think it is our primary obligation and duty to see to it that the American taxpayers' dollars are expended wisely, and without fraud and inefficient administration.

I ask the Senator why it is necessary for us to rush through important bills in the closing days of the session, when we may be back in August or September at the call of the President, if we ourselves do not have the statesmanship to arrange and plan for such sessions.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator for his words. I agree with them.

Mr. President, I have another inquiry to address to the majority leader at this time. I wish to ask him what his plans are with respect to adjournment sine die or a recess; and if a recess, on what basis.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I see no reason why the Senate should not adjourn sine die.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona speak louder?

Mr. McFARLAND. I see no reason why the Senate should not adjourn sine die.

Mr. CORDON. Does the majority leader plan to introduce a resolution for a sine die adjournment?

Mr. McFARLAND. Such resolutions usually originate in the House. When

they are sent to the Senate, the Senate acts upon them.

Mr. CORDON. Has the majority leader been in consultation with the leadership of the House on this matter?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have talked with the leadership of the House many times.

Mr. CORDON. On this matter?

Mr. McFARLAND. On the matter of adjournment sine die. It has always been the opinion, as expressed by the leadership of the House, that when Congress adjourns, it should adjourn sine die.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desired to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. It is seldom that I have the floor.

If there is to be an adjournment sine die, it means that Congress will not come back into session for the remainder of the year, except on call of the President. It means that whatever legislation is before the committee or in on the calendar dies, so far as control by Congress is concerned, unless there be a call back into session. That is the reason why I inquired whether there were other matters which the majority leader has in mind bringing up for debate and passage.

If the majority leader intends to limit generally the legislative program to the finishing of appropriation bills, and then to close the session, I shall reluctantly not present the point of order. I have asked the question. Do I have an answer?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is hoped to call up small bills, including one farm bill, which desire it is to dispose of if it can be done. Senators on both sides of the aisle have spoken to me about small bills. I do not have arrangements made for them at this time. I do not have their order worked out at this time, because I had expected that we would proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill.

I have said that most of the other bills would not necessarily have to be passed. I am rather of the opinion that Congress should be measured by the quality of the legislation, rather than the quantity of legislation.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. As the Senator from Oregon has said, we could return and meet in August. But what would we do?

This is a political year. A lot of political speeches would be made. There would be a lot of bickering. I do not think anything would be gained for the welfare of the Nation.

Congress may not agree with me, when it comes time to adjourn. If it does not agree with me, it does not have to. But I certainly do not see what good we could accomplish by coming back during a political campaign. I believe in campaigns. I think they are good things for the country. We have our party system. We put

our respective cases before the people, and the people decide. I am willing to work all the time. I usually work when I go home. I think that is true of Senators generally.

If I may be indulged for a few moments, I wish to say that I have never seen the Senate work harder or in a more orderly fashion than it has worked during this session. We have had no all-night sessions. We have tried to respect the strength of Senators, and not work hardship on them. Every Senator works when he goes home. I work just as hard at home as I do when I am on the floor of the Senate. So it would make no difference to me.

I believe that if the distinguished Senator from Oregon would allow us to proceed, we could accomplish more than by going on to something else. We shall not be able to dispose of this bill in a few minutes. If the Senator has different ideas about adjournment or recess, he will have the opportunity to present them at the proper time.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I made the inquiry with reference to the order of business because there is very little time left. The majority leader suggests that in his view there should be an adjournment sine die. I am not quarreling with that view at all. I am simply calling attention to the fact that if that is done certain results will necessarily follow. One of them will be that legislation now pending will die. I call that fact to his attention and to the attention of other Senators. Many Senators are interested in certain legislation which they would like to see passed. If that legislation is not passed at this session, they must start anew at another session.

That brings about a very pressing problem. It emphasizes again the fact that there is not time enough left, if we are to adjourn at the end of this week, for that consideration which is necessary if we are to have the quality of legislation which the majority leader has just stated he favors. I favor it, too, Mr. President. I am making this statement because we are now about to have before us for consideration a motion to go forward with an appropriation bill involving some \$10,000,000,000. We shall not know when we are through, whether it is quality legislation or quantity legislation, because we have not had the opportunity to obtain the information necessary to determine that question.

There will be one call after another on the majority leader for the consideration of other bills. He will be called upon to bring up this bill and that bill and the other bill. At the end he will be swamped with such requests. There is a danger involved in such procedure, that we shall pass, in our hurry, legislation which we may regret for a long time, and which may be prejudicial to the best interests of the people of the United States.

That is another problem which we face. That is the reason why I ask whether we are going through with the same kind of program this year. So far

as the requests are concerned, no one knows how many there will be. They will be made, and it will require a strong majority leader to deny them. Most of them should be denied. Whether they will be or not, time alone can tell.

I regret that I felt it necessary to make this statement, but I feel very deeply on the subject. I am chagrined. I feel that I am a part of a vast failure of public duty, and I make that statement frankly on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall not make a point of order. I shall hold on to a thin hope that perhaps the work we did up until midnight last night, which work is now to come before the Senate, will have most serious consideration. It was the best we could do within the time we had to do it. That time was tragically insufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

ACTIVITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OFFICIALS IN CONNECTION WITH 1948 ELECTION CAMPAIGN

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on June 9 I inserted in the RECORD a statement which I had prepared for delivery on the floor of the Senate, but which I was precluded from making because of the time limitation on debate which existed at that time.

In that statement I pointed out how, after the Congress had adjourned on June 20, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Under Secretary, the President, and other speakers went around the country telling the farmers that there was not adequate storage for their grain that fall, and that they could not obtain loans on their grain unless it was properly stored, thereby forcing thousands of them to dump their grain upon the market for whatever they could get, which proved to be greatly depressed prices.

I pointed out how this resulted in putting the prices of all grains, as well as the prices of other farm commodities, on the skids, so that by the last of October farm prices were pretty well down in the slough of despond.

The same speakers who erroneously told the farmers that there was no storage for their grain when, in fact, there was storage in abundance, also told them that Congress was to blame for the situation in which they found themselves.

I pointed out in my statement of June 9 how the probable loss to the farmers was about \$1,000,000,000 that year, because certain persons made false statements around the country for political purposes.

As I expected, the Secretary of Agriculture was not very happy over my statement. Under date of June 25, 1952, he wrote me a 5-page letter undertaking to defend himself against the charges which I had made. He also sent me a copy of a 28-page memorandum which I understand has been mimeographed and distributed in great quantities

around the country. This 28-page memorandum also undertakes to defend the Secretary and his political clique against the charges which I made, that they deliberately forced down the prices of farm commodities in the fall of 1948.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator believe that the Secretary of Agriculture would need not 28 pages, but 128 pages in order to defend the miserable record which he has made?

Mr. AIKEN. There are not pages enough in any book adequately to defend the record which the Secretary of Agriculture has made in the past 4 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not also a fact that its own records show that the Department of Agriculture was actually selling grain bins during the 1948 campaign, when it was alleged that there was a shortage of storage space?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. I will come to that subject later. The Secretary has been convicted by the records out of his own office, time and time again.

The 5-page letter to me from the Secretary and the 28-page memorandum are, like other statements emanating from the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, replete with misleading inferences and misstatements. I have analyzed the defense of the Secretary of Agriculture against the charge that he has deliberately used his high office for political purposes.

This morning I sent a letter to the Secretary, which undoubtedly he has received by now. I shall read a copy of the letter:

JULY 3, 1952.

HON. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received your letter of June 25 and also the 28-page document purporting to explain your operations during the fall of 1948.

May I call your attention to the fact that the first line of the document is incorrect. There are no charges that "the Department of Agriculture deliberately drove down prices of farm commodities prior to the 1948 presidential election in order to influence that election."

The charges are that you, President Truman and your political associates used the powers of the Department of Agriculture and your positions to depress farm prices in the fall of 1948 for political purposes.

The Department of Agriculture is one of the most respected agencies of Government. I am sure that not only most of the 70,000 regular employees of the Department, but most of the 95,000 county and community committeemen of the FMA as well deplore the political manipulations which tend to bring discredit upon the Department itself.

Mr. President, it will be seen that the Secretary of Agriculture would make it appear that the charges are directed against the Department of Agriculture. Nothing could be further from the truth. The charges are directed against his attempts to use the Department of Agriculture to satisfy his insatiable political

sary or desirable in the conduct of its business."

This authority was stricken from the bill in the House Banking and Currency Committee and as passed by the House of Representatives⁵ and enacted by the Congress. Section 4 (h) of the new Charter Act as enacted on June 29, 1948,⁶ provided: "may contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business and it may continue to lease (by renewing or extending existing leases or entering into new leases) property leased by it on the date of the enactment of this act."

Thus, in lieu of authority to acquire, hold and dispose of real and personal property, the Corporation was authorized only to contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of facilities for storing agricultural commodities subject to its control, and was expressly forbidden to acquire or lease any facility for the storage of agricultural commodities subject to its control, or any real property or interest therein with limited exceptions relating only to office space and property already owned or leased by the Corporation.⁷

It is to be noted particularly that section 16 of the Charter Act—which provided for the transfer to the Federal Corporation of all the property owned by the Delaware corporation—was the only section excepted from the operation of the prohibitions of section 4 (h). Consequently, section 5 (b) of the Charter Act—which authorizes the Corporation to make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities—or the authority conferred upon the Corporation by any other section of the Charter Act, could be utilized only subject to the limitations imposed by section 4 (h) on the right of the Corporation to acquire or lease storage facilities or real property or any interest therein.

A statement to the same effect was filed by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, excerpts from which follow:⁸

"The contention has been made by Mr. Walter R. Scott, of the Kansas City Board of Trade, in hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry concerned with proposed amendments to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, that section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act applies only to real property and does not impose any restriction upon the acquisition of any other type of storage facilities, and a secondary argument that, irrespective of the meaning of section 4 (h), another provision in the charter, section 5 (b), was clearly recognized as giving express authority for Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire grain bins and similar portable storage facilities.

"The contention that section 4 (h) is restricted to real property is dispelled by a reading of the section. Section 4 (h) forbids Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire or lease 'any such plant or facility [for the storage, handling, transportation, etc., of commodities subject to the Corporation's control] or to acquire or lease real property

or any interest therein.' The language, 'any such plant or facility,' would be clearly surplusage and unnecessary if it were intended to mean only those plants and facilities which were real property. 'Such facilities' relates to transportation facilities as well as to storage facilities, and these facilities are largely personalty. In fact, Mr. H. E. Sanford, appearing before the House Banking and Currency Committee for the National Grain Trade Council, stated that he desired the limitation to include, among others, barges and boats, which must be classified as personal property.

"Even assuming that the restriction is applicable only to real property, its hampering effect upon the Corporation's operations is obvious. For example, the Corporation is not only prohibited from acquiring or leasing any storage facility which is considered to be real property, but it could not even lease bin sites upon which to erect grain bins."

As a result of the express prohibitions in the Charter Act as enacted on June 29, 1948, the Corporation's authority to provide adequate storage facilities was practically eliminated. Major effects of these restrictions were:

The Corporation could not acquire or lease sites for grain bins, including new sites for bins already owned by the Corporation, since to do so would violate the prohibition against acquiring or leasing real property.

The Corporation could not acquire or lease any facility, including grain bins, for the storage of commodities delivered to it under its price support programs, since to do so would violate the prohibition against acquiring or leasing any facility for storage of agricultural commodities subject to the Corporation's control.

The Corporation could not acquire grain bins for resale to farmers for the storage of agricultural commodities to be subjected to the control of the Corporation by being placed under the loan program, since to do so would violate the prohibition against acquiring any facility for the storage of agricultural commodities subject to the Corporation's control.

The Corporation could not, for the purpose of financing the construction of grain bins, make loans to farmers upon the security of bins which became attached to and a part of the realty, since to do so would violate the prohibition against acquiring an interest in real property. Even though the grain bins did not become a part of the realty, the Corporation could not take chattel mortgages on bins constructed for the storage of commodities to be placed under its loan programs in States where chattel mortgages pass title to the mortgagee, since the Corporation, by doing so, would be acquiring title to a facility for the storage of an agricultural commodity subject to its control.

At the time the charter bill was under consideration by the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture wrote to Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, directing his attention to the adverse effect of these and other restrictions.⁹

On June 16, 1948, the Secretary referred specifically to section 4 (h) and stated that "this prohibition would have the following harmful effects, among others:

"The Corporation could not, therefore, lease sites for the approximately 20,000 grain bins which it now maintains for stand-by storage, principally in the Corn Belt.

"The Corporation could not acquire by lease or otherwise emergency facilities necessary to preserve agricultural commodities.

"The Corporation could not acquire an interest in real property for the purpose of securing or discharging debts owing to it or

protecting its interests in foreclosure proceedings.

"The Corporation could not utilize excess storage space owned and made available by other Government agencies despite that economy in Government operations would demand that such space be utilized."

Two days later Congressman HOPE explained to the membership of the House of Representatives the seriousness of these restrictions.¹⁰ After expressing a regret that the bill was brought up under suspension of rules which did not permit amendment, Congressman HOPE stated:

"This is a very important measure. The Commodity Credit Corporation furnishes the machinery through which the price-support programs on agricultural commodities are carried out. Without the Commodity Credit Corporation, it would be impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the mandate of Congress that prices on certain agricultural commodities be supported.

"There are two very serious defects in the bill as it now stands. One of them is that the bill prohibits the Corporation from acquiring or leasing any plant or facility for warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, or from acquiring or leasing real property or any interest therein except the rental of office space."

Congressman HOPE explained that this provision, together with another one not here pertinent, "severely restricts the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation" and would "make it very difficult for the agency to carry out the duties imposed on it by law."

President Truman, upon signing the new Charter Act, commented on the restriction, as follows:

"S. 1322 also prohibits the Commodity Credit Corporation from continuing its long-standing policy of leasing or acquiring land where necessary for storing commodities as close to the farm as possible. This restriction will mean that the Corporation will have to ship grain for livestock feeding, for example, from farms to distant points for storage, and then later to ship it back again to farm areas. This will obviously increase costs for carrying grain reserves. Only those special interests who will make money by unnecessary handling of grain will profit from this provision—which will in the end be paid for by farmers and consumers."

In an analysis of the Charter Act made by Senator AIKEN and inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD¹¹ several weeks after the Conference Report¹² on the bill had been adopted and after approval of the act, it was stated that the powers conferred by section 4 (m) of the Charter Act—this section confers upon the Corporation such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally—include the power, in any manner, to hold, acquire, and dispose of personal property or any interest therein, as the Corporation deems necessary in the conduct of its business. In view of the deletion from the Charter bill, as introduced, of the authority for the Corporation to acquire, hold and dispose of personal property, it is obvious that it was necessary to derive this authority from the incidental powers of the Corporation. Otherwise the Corporation could not even have conducted its price support loan and purchase programs which involve the acquisition and disposal of agricultural commodities (which are personal property). It is equally obvious, however, that the incidental or implied powers of the Corporation, or any other power conferred upon the Corporation by the Charter Act,

⁵ Sec. 4 (h), S. 1322, 80th Cong.; 94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8867 (June 18, 1948).

⁶ Public Law 806, 80th Cong., 62 Stat. 1070.

⁷ Secs. 4 (h), and 16, Public Law 806, 80th Cong., 62 Stat. 1071, 1075.

⁸ Feb. 23, 1949, at p. 81 of hearings on S. 900.

⁹ 94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8870 (June 18, 1948).

¹⁰ 94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD A4409 (July 7, 1948).

¹¹ H. Rept. No. 2444 (June 19, 1948).

could not under any circumstances override the express and unequivocal prohibition in the act against acquiring storage facilities. Indeed, as has been pointed out above, the only provision of the Charter Act which was excepted from the prohibition against acquiring storage facilities or real property or any interest therein was the provision in section 16 for the transfer to the Federal corporation of all property owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a Delaware corporation.

The Congress fully recognized the restrictive effect of section 4 (h) as originally enacted when in 1949 it took action to remove the restrictions.¹² It was stated by the House committee in its report on the bill to amend the Charter Act that—

"Restrictions contained in section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act approved in June 1948 prohibited the Commodity Credit Corporation from taking any effective action toward alleviating the storage deficiencies, and would prevent it from doing so in the future. * * *

"This section (sec. 2 of H. R. 2682) would amend section 4 (h) of the Charter Act to restore to the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to acquire items of personal property used in connection with the care and preservation of agricultural commodities controlled by it. In addition, it will permit the Corporation to acquire such real property and such plants and facilities which are part of the realty as are necessary to provide adequate storage. The statute now in effect prevents the Corporation from acquiring or leasing any plant or facility for physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control, or from acquiring or leasing real property or any interest therein, except office space and real property owned by or leased by the Delaware corporation on the date of enactment of the Charter Act.

"The change proposed in the bill will permit the Corporation to utilize fully other authority contained in the charter in such a manner as to develop a well-rounded program under which it could acquire grain bins and other storage facilities, make available such facilities to producers through the purchase and resale of bins and materials, make loans to construct or otherwise acquire such facilities, and assist in the solution of storage problems through other means.

"As previously indicated in this report, this amendment is necessary in order to make the benefits of the price-support program fully available to farmers."¹³

Statements to the same effect were contained in the report of the Senate committee.¹⁴

Thus, the ban on providing storage facilities essential to carrying out the price support program was removed, and in 1949 the Commodity Credit Corporation launched a grain storage program under the new authority.

Alleviating action taken in 1948 in the absence of authority to provide storage facilities

Meanwhile, however, the Department had started all steps within its very restricted authority to do everything it could to alleviate the situation. It began a study of available storage facilities as soon as it became apparent that 1948 crop production would be unusually large. This study revealed five points of justification for a storage program:

1. Farm storage facilities had deteriorated during the war.
2. Storage problems were expected in 1948-49 due to large crops coupled with reduced export demand and feeding.

3. Additional farm storage facilities of about 900,000,000 bushels were needed in main producing areas.

4. Present and anticipated prices pointed to prospects of large farmer participation in price support.

5. Information which would enable farmers to build better farm storage facilities would be of direct benefit to CCC since it would enable CCC loan grain to be kept in better condition.

On July 26, 1948, the Department issued a press release (USDA 1549-48) in which Secretary Brannan urged farmers to arrange to store a substantial portion of 1948 crops on their farms. This was urged to permit orderly marketing in view of the expected large crops and the fact that commercial facilities were unable to accommodate the anticipated large volume. The Secretary indicated that all agencies of the Department had been asked to help farmers make maximum use of their storage and help construct new facilities.

On July 30, 1948, the CCC Board of Directors authorized \$225,000 to carry out projects to develop the most efficient methods of storing and conditioning grain owned or controlled by CCC under price support. Projects were to consist of (1) tests and experiments to improve the quality of grain held on farms as collateral against CCC price support loans, and (2) demonstration of results to acquaint interested persons with latest designs in storage structures and conditioning equipment for the proper care of grain both prior to and during the storage period. Projects were to be conducted at Beltsville, Md., and selected points in important grain producing areas during the year ending June 30, 1949.

On August 6, 1948, the Department issued another press release (USDA 1665-48) in which Secretary Brannan repeated his appeal of July 26 that farmers take steps to put farm storage facilities in shape and increase facilities so that more grain could be stored on farms. He pointed out that loans could not be granted unless proper storage was assured and that purchase agreements would lose much of their effectiveness as price protection if unsatisfactory storage should cause grain to deteriorate.

On August 28, 1948, Under Secretary Loveland warned (USDA 1804-48) that on the basis of increased production shown in the August crop report, several hundred million bushels of grain would be unprotected from the weather unless additional farm storage facilities were built. He pointed out that storage problems would be most acute for the later produced crops—corn, grain, sorghums, and spring wheat. He urged farmers to construct temporary facilities if they could not construct permanent facilities and to store as much corn as possible on the farm where it is fed. The Under Secretary indicated that plans for temporary and permanent cribs were available at county agricultural conservation offices and from county agents.

Storage demonstration projects were carried out in 1948 for the benefit of thousands of farmers in 13 States. Meetings were held to give instructions on the building of farm storage facilities and to demonstrate different types of farm storage bins and cribs, as well as portable drying equipment. States in which projects were carried out included Maryland, Virginia, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.

Research projects in 1948-49 included (1) a grain sorghums project in cooperation with the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station at Beeville, Tex., (2) a rice project in cooperation with the Louisiana State University Agricultural Experiment Station at Crowley, La., and (3) an ear corn project with the Virginia State Agricultural Experiment Station at Holland, Va.

County storage remained critical

The critical problem during this harvest period was to find storage space on or near the farm for corn and other late-harvested crops. Storage space at large terminals would be a problem later, but it was the lack of country storage that depressed prices then.

For example, it has been said that at times in the fall of 1948 only about 60 percent of the terminal elevator space in the Chicago area was occupied, but this fact would have little or no direct relationship to the storage problems confronting farm producers.

Terminal space of the type in question would be of no use to the Iowa farmer who needed storage space on or near his farm, so that he could put his crop under the protection of the Government price support program. Incidentally, only a very small part of the corn crop moves out of the area in which it is grown.

Commercial elevator space is frequently not available for farmers on a rental basis, because the elevators may prefer to hold space for their own use in speculative buying and selling. Storage space must be of the right kind, in the right locations, and available to farmers when they need it, if it is to meet their storage problems.

The 1949 storage program

As soon as the restrictions on storage facilities were lifted, the Department immediately initiated a broad national program of storage to meet those problems.

It bought supplemental storage bins and cribs with a capacity of more than 500,000,000 bushels.

It extended loans to farmers to assist them in buying or building their own on-farm facilities. An increase of 85,000,000 bushels capacity of farm storage was aided directly by this measure.

Commercial storage facilities were also increased by 93,000,000 bushels as the result of use guaranties extended by the Department in shortage areas.

The total increase in storage facilities under this coordinated program, during the 1949-50 period, was more than 700,000,000 bushels. As a result, and in spite of the big 1949 crops which were added to substantial carry-overs from 1948 production, most farmers were able to find suitable storage after 1949 harvests. The price support programs were fully operative and effective again.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill, 1953.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am going to ask that the bill be read for action on the committee amendments, but before doing that, I wish to take about 2 minutes in making a reply to what has been said regarding the bill.

¹² Public Law 85, 81st Cong., 63 Stat. 154.

¹³ H. Rept. No. 418 on H. R. 2682, pp. 5, 6.

¹⁴ S. Rept. No. 125 on S. 900, pp. 2, 3.

The total estimates for the bill were \$13,867,000,000. The amount carried in the bill as passed by the House was \$10,127,000,000. The amount of decrease by the Senate committee is the enormous sum of \$1,893,000,000, a cut of almost \$2,000,000,000 under the House figure. That shows that the committee has carefully considered the items in the bill.

We started with estimates from the Department of \$13,867,000,000—nearly \$14,000,000,000. The House cut the figure down to roughly \$10,000,000,000, and the Senate has cut it nearly \$2,000,000,000 more.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 477) to continue in effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 9028-9029 of House proceedings of July 2, 1952.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Nevada explain what the conference report does with respect to the provisions to which objection was raised in connection with the amendments proposed to be offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] some days ago?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Eastland amendment and the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Nevada were both dropped in conference. The only change from the House language is that, instead of the act terminating on June 30, 1953, it terminates on April 1, 1953.

On April 28, 1952, the treaty of peace between Japan and the United States and the other signatory powers went into effect. On the same date the President issued proclamation No. 2974, which brought to an end the national emergencies previously proclaimed on September 8, 1939, and May 27, 1941. These actions had the effect of either instantly terminating or beginning the termination period of approximately 155 laws, whose effectiveness depended upon the existence of a state of war or the emergencies referred to above, except that Congress had enacted temporary extensions of some of these powers until action could be had on the resolution presently being considered.

In the meantime, on February 19, the President had requested Congress to extend for the duration of the national

emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950, plus 6 months, 60 of the 155 laws which would ordinarily have expired. The proposals were considered by the Judiciary Committees of the respective Houses, and after extensive hearings covering 614 printed pages at which all interested parties were heard and after careful and intensive study it was decided to extend 40 of the requested 60 powers for a period which would terminate on April 1, 1953. It is believed that this will provide an opportunity to the interested agencies to come before the proper committee which has jurisdiction over the substantive law relating to their agency and request permanent legislation to obtain the objectives sought by this temporary extension.

The powers eliminated by this joint resolution are as follows:

1 (a) (5) Authorization for detailing Armed Forces personnel to the Veterans' Administration.

1 (a) (6) Liability of inductees to serve in Reserve components and be ordered to active duty in time of war.

1 (a) (9) Military status of commissioned corps of the Public Health Service and uniform allowances in time of war.

1 (a) (34) Recall to wartime duty of retired Public Health Service officers.

1 (a) (16) Provision permitting voting by mail of persons serving in the land or naval forces.

1 (a) (23) Payment for use of wharves and landings under control of the Territory of Hawaii.

1 (a) (24) Rights under public lands laws of persons serving in the Armed Forces of allies of the United States.

2 (b) (7) Veterans' preference under the homestead and other land laws.

2 (b) (8) Veterans' preference with respect to lands within the Boulder Canyon project.

2 (c) Homestead preference for veterans.

1 (a) (27) Power of the President to assume control of transportation systems in time of war.

2 (b) (4) Gold Star lapel buttons.

The powers which have been extended have been extended after reaching the studied conclusion that in this critical period they are extremely necessary to the national defense and security of this country, and I wish to emphasize again that in no event are any of the powers to be continued beyond April 1, 1953, unless so recommended by committees of the Congress having jurisdiction over the substantive law involved.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appeal to Senators to see if we can not do some work on the bill. It is a very important bill. With respect to that part of it dealing with Europe, I do not favor it, but the committee has agreed upon it. It was reported almost unanimously. I hope we may make some progress with the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator read the totals on the first page of the report, which indicate that the bill as reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee is \$1,893,254,494 below the House bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. However, it is a fact, is it not, that the Senate committee recommended a reduction in one item of defense construction of \$2,046,499,840 below the House, solely because there was no statutory authority for the appropriation? If that is excepted, then the action recommended by the Senate committee would be \$153,245,346 above the House figure. Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct; but he says "if." The authorizing legislation has not yet been passed.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator agrees, does he not, that if the legislation does pass, before final consummation of this appropriation there will be included defense construction money?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true. By the same token, if we were to quit giving our money away in Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, South America, Malaya, Burma, India, Hindustan, and other parts of the world, we would have a smaller bill by \$6,000,000,000, because \$6,100,000,000 goes for those purposes.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator entirely. Will the Senator yield for a further inquiry before he takes his seat? It relates to his over-all statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield. I should like to proceed with the consideration of the amendments, and see if we cannot dispose of them. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I prefer to tie these figures in with the Senator's statement. Otherwise I could reiterate the whole thing, which would be useless.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the Senator go ahead.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate that.

There is also included in the recommendation of the Senate committee to the Senate a contract authority for the Atomic Energy Commission, in round numbers, of \$2,100,000,000 more than the House bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. The figures shown on the first page of the report, as is usual, indicate the dollar situation as it exists,

without an explanation as to additional contract authority or as to the figures for construction, which went out on a technical basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am simply talking about this bill.

Mr. CORDON. So am I.

Mr. McKELLAR. This bill reduces the amount proposed to be appropriated by the House by \$1,893,254,494. In other words, we are not spending the money in this bill, whatever we may spend in bills to come.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As the distinguished Senator knows, I have been opposed to the give-away policy—loans, and all that sort of thing—ever since I have been in the Senate. In connection with the \$6,100,000,000 about which the distinguished Senator is speaking, my views were pretty well expressed by Associate Justice William O. Douglas in an address delivered before the National Conference on International Economic and Social Developments, on April 7, last.

Instead of my taking the time to go into the subject as fully and as completely as I should like to do, which would probably take an hour, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the address of Associate Justice Douglas.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be included in this conference. As I have seen the type of organizations that are affiliated in this session my hopes have risen. This is a diverse group, a group of different points of view, groups that have sterling character and idealism, and that represent the various segments of American life. I think groups of this character can forge a program for us in the very difficult days ahead. It is out of the community of action where there is a freedom of thought and freedom of discussion and a wide range of inquiry into all phases of a problem that we can hope to get the kind of unanimity that will carry us through the dark days that face us. I haven't had an opportunity to participate in very many of the sessions to hear what is going on. I had some spies sitting in the audiences reporting to me, and what they brought back was very encouraging. I was disappointed, however, that most of your discussions to date have been factual and statistical, and that you had left, apparently, at least, the controversial subjects to me.

I was sorry, for example, to hear that there were too many people in certain professions. Immediately I thought of the lawyers. Is there anyone here who doesn't think that there are too many lawyers—except the lawyers? Are there any lawyers here, by the way? Would any lawyer dare raise his hand? Well, I counted a few; and if any of you lawyers should feel depressed, let me tell you this: One of the byproducts of my wanderings around the earth has been a message of hope to the lawyers. I was in Israel visiting a cooperative farm and we were drinking Coca-Cola, I think it was, and we got into a very depressing subject—of lawyers—and finally one of the farmers changed the subject and he said, "You know that the poorest farmers in Israel are the people who before they were farmers in Israel were farmers in Europe, and the next best

farmers in Israel were the people who, before they were farmers in Israel, were dentists and doctors in Europe." Then he said, "But the very best farmers in Israel were those who once were lawyers." So to my own little union I say, "Cheer up, for there may be a very bright future ahead of us."

I have no prepared manuscript. I have no speech. I come to you with no qualifications, except I have had the privilege of visiting in the Middle East and Asia for three summers. I have seen most of the country from the Mediterranean to the Pacific, and I have come back filled with prejudices. I have traveled it with my eyes and my ears looking and listening for things that I thought were important to Americans. But each time I came back with my heart very heavy and my mind filled with fear for the future of America, because I realized that America did not understand the world in which it was living.

I do not pretend to be an expert. All I can hope to provide is a point of view, but I do think that we need a different point of view, and a new point of view, else this great civilization that we call the civilization of the west may disappear. If it does, it will carry with it not only the things that we hold dear but the hopes and the aspirations of little people all around the world—the little people of the rice fields of southeast Asia, the aspirations of the goatherders of Persia. That is because we are more important, we Americans, we of the west, are more important than we have pretended to be. We have, in large part, been assuming, in my opinion, a false role that is not true to our character, not true to our ideals, not true to our civilization. If I can ask your indulgence, I will explain what I mean.

We in America have been engrossed in the luxuries of our own civilization—our golf clubs, our hot dogs, our soft drinks—the rich, material civilization that our productive capacity has given us. We have imagined that other people should be like us. We are industrialized and have these things; therefore, other people should be industrialized, and they can have these same things. But as one of your reporters indicated tonight, this industrialization business is a very difficult, a very involved problem. This summer I was where few Americans have been. I was on the Sinkiang border—up in the Karakoram in an area called Gilgit, Hunza, and Nagir. The habitable portion of the region is about a half mile wide and a hundred to two hundred miles long. The valleys are around 5,000 feet and the canyon walls go up as high as 28,000 feet. It is a bleak, desolate, terrifying country. Those people, in February and March, have nothing left to eat. It is one of those food-deficit areas. They have enough for 10 months, and the problem in March and April is to find enough outcroppings of new weeds or flowers that will carry them through. That is what those good people of the Gilgit area are doing now. They are tightening their belts.

They can't grow anything more than they are growing no matter how much point 4 technical assistance you bring them. But there is something that can be done from the industrial point of view that can help them. There is an American by the name of John Clark from St. Charles, Ill., a geologist, a graduate of Princeton, about 40 years old, who is now in a hospital with amoebic dysentery that he got in this area. John Clark went in there 2 years ago. He had a "vest pocket" point 4, developed by John Clark. He taught these people simple industrial skills: how to make a pipe, how to turn a lathe. By the way, up to last summer, no wheel had ever been seen in parts of this area. John Clark brought them a few of the rudiments of industrial civilization.

The reason he did it was that they needed exports—something they could trade: a pipe, a piece of cloth—and send over the high passes of the Karakoram and the Himalayas, down to the Punjab in exchange for food. When John Clark, a self-financed American, left that region in November 1951 he couldn't get on his horse until he had walked 6 miles. The reason he couldn't get on his horse until he had walked 6 miles was because the people were lined up to shake hands with him, and kiss him, and thank him for coming in. There is no other experience of mine abroad that has been as moving, from the American point of view, except one. And that was when a Negro lawyer from Chicago, Edith Sampson—God bless her—stood up in New Delhi, India, and defended America on the race issue before a hostile audience.

Industrialization is a big problem. In the Gilgit area it means doing the kind of a thing that John Clark did, teaching the people simple things, teaching them how to utilize a few of their resources, not opening up great power projects, not opening up great mines that some absentee group of stockholders will exploit, but teaching them simple skills. I suppose that those of you who have seen Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi, and the other big population centers of India and Asia, will appreciate as I appreciate the great dangers of quick industrialization. If private capital were turned loose and if the physical potentialities of that part of the world were exploited in the full sense, there would easily develop in a few years the greatest sweatshops in the world. Those who criticize Nehru for being a Socialist don't understand the background of India and the environment out of which he came. That's what Nehru is against—exploitation. That's why Nehru stands for his brand of socialism. That's why Nehru stands for his type of controlled and managed capitalism. Nehru does not want sweatshops in India. You can appreciate how great a sweatshop it would be when you realize that a skilled laborer in India gets \$1 a day in American money, and the unskilled labor gets around 25 cents a day. Industrialization, as we know it, presupposes a lot of other things. It presupposes labor unions. It presupposes the organization of labor so that labor will get its fair share of the production, so that it will not become the victim, so that it will become the slave.

Industrialization even on the farms presupposes a lot in the Middle East and Asia. In 1950 I was near Kermanshah in Iran. That's up in the northwest—a big, broad valley that looks very much like the valley that stretches south from San Francisco to Los Angeles, a beautiful valley, rich in bottom land. There is a wonderful man up there. He's a big landlord, but not the vicious type of absentee landlord that has placed a curse upon the Middle East and Asia. His name is Tavakoli. If he were here tonight, I would introduce him with great pride to this American audience. Tavakoli is a man who has seen the same vision that many of our industrialists have seen in America—the vision of a broad base of participation of the wealth of the country—opportunities for everyone—dignity and justice and freedom for all classes. Tavakoli has some model villages near Kermanshah. When I asked him about his American farm machinery that he had imported, there was sadness in his eyes because he had \$500,000 worth of it and it was all broken down; and there was not a mechanic in Persia that could fix it. There were no mechanics and there were no spare parts. We often imagine that conditions in one country are similar to conditions in another. But even in Persia, the country that is a first or second cousin to us, there are no mechanics who can fix this farm machinery. There are no

factories to produce spare parts. And in 1950 there was no foreign exchange to import it. As a result Tavakoli had \$500,000 of American farm machinery idle. I went down to see his beet sugar fields out of Kermanshah. He had artesian wells and there were pumps to bring the water at various levels to the fields. But the pumps weren't working. I asked him why and he said because the valves broke and there are no valves in Persia and there was no factory to produce them.

This problem of industrialization is very complicated. It includes many aspects. We have over-simplified it in our thinking. It can be done; but it will take many years and must have slow beginnings. When you see the Middle East and Asia, you begin to understand how wise a man Ghandi was and why he started talking about industrialization at the level of the home and the level of the village.

Point 4 is a great conception. I have been very critical of point 4 and tonight I will at times be very critical in some things that I will say about point 4. I do not intend to condemn it. I think that point 4 is fine, particularly if we get point 5 to go along with it.

Point 4 in Persia has done a very good job, by and large. Isfahan is one of the most beautiful eastern cities that I have ever seen, as remote from anything that we in America have as you can imagine. Isfahan is in the center of a region where there has been a wide distribution of land. Our point 4 people have done a very fine job in Isfahan. The reason they have done a good job is because they start their base of operations at a level which will benefit the people of the country. They have also done throughout Persia and Iran a very fine public health job in malaria control. Point 4, as an isolated venture, is a very difficult thing to justify in many countries. But that is not true in Isfahan. It is not true in areas like Uttar Pradesh in India, where there has been considerable progress in the break-up of the landed estates, or Himachal Pradesh in northwest India, or in parts of Kashmir. In some of those places point 4 at the agricultural level could have a very profound effect. In other places, it might be almost a monstrosity. Let me illustrate what I mean.

In this part of the world of which I speak, 8 out of 10 of the babies die before they reach the age of 1. We could take the simple public health measures that we know in this country, send out a half dozen experts from country to country, and stop those babies from dying. We could do there what we did in Puerto Rico. It would be easy. Control the water supply, learn how to vaccinate for dysentery, and so on, and all would be well. But if we stopped there without more, we would be doing nothing but increasing the number of people among whom you would have to ration the poverty. We could send out our agricultural experts and we could increase the production of the land 10 percent, 20 percent, perhaps 50 percent. In large portions of this part of the world of which I speak, the net return to the man who works the land is between 5 percent and 10 percent of the crop; the rest of it goes to the landlord, many of whom are absentee landlords. Most of them live in Paris, Rome, or Beirut. Those people who get the 5 percent to 10 percent of the crop have barely enough to live on. They don't have enough to send their children to school. They don't have enough to have medical care or hospitals. They don't have enough to provide what we call material civilization, such as bathrooms, water taps, electric fans, radios, rugs on the floor. These people live in dirt and misery. Increase the production of that land 10 percent, 25

percent, 50 percent, and most of it will go to the man who owns the land. Some of those countries are owned by 200 men for whom 3,500,000 people work. Increase the productivity of that land and you make 200 men wealthier. Why should American taxpayers undertake that kind of a project?

This business of point 4 becomes complicated. It is easy to figure out a way whereby with the same amount of food you can increase the weight of a hog from 85 pounds to 100 pounds; how cross-breeding can push the number of eggs per hen up; how as a result of this or that or of the other thing you can increase the yield of millet, or barley, or wheat 10 percent. But point 4 cannot be judged merely from a technical viewpoint. The Middle East and Asia have a feudal economy, a feudal political, social, and economic system. That system was long supported by the British and made very romantic by the British. But those who want to stabilize that situation are the most dangerous people in the world. They are the ones most apt to accelerate the trend of that part of the world to communism. You cannot stabilize feudalism in the world today and expect to survive.

What begat communism in Russia? Feudalism. What is the great political strength of Russia in any part of the world? Feudalism. As long as there is an opportunity for people to work and to meet the ordinary requirements of life, none of these desperate creeds will have any appeal to our people; nor will they appeal to other people.

One who is down at the bottom—as you would be if you were a peasant in the Middle East—would have to take desperate measures to escape. The desperate measures are the measures to get rid of the feudalism. I have heard American officials talk about underwriting the status quo in the Middle East and Asia. That means in plain language underwriting the 200 men in charge of a country—stabilizing the political control of a government of the landlords, by the landlords, and for the landlords. Ladies and gentlemen, it cannot be done. With all the wealth of America, it cannot be done. With all the atomic bombs of America, it cannot be done. This is a revolution that is going on—a revolution against the control by a few men of the destinies of the great masses of the people. I have been among them, I have eaten with them, I have walked with them, I have slept with them. They are wonderful people—as fine as the people in our communities here. I say that when we go with the point 4 program, let us be prepared to make up our minds whom we are for. Are we for the people or are we for the landlords? Don't think we can avoid the issue. We won't be there—our point 4 people won't be there a week—before we will have to take sides. It cannot be avoided. The peasants will ask, "For whose benefit is this increased production going to accrue? Is it going to accrue to us or is it going to accrue to the man who lives in Paris?"

I'm very happy that many of our people have stood up in the villages and said, "We're for you." It made me feel good, because I knew that that's what a town meeting in America would vote. But I've also seen other Americans in other projects who have been aligned on the side of the landlords. We can't take that position if we want to be in a position of leadership. Whatever you may desire, whatever you may wish, point 4 is a political instrument. Point 4, like ECA, is going to weld an economy either one way or the other. As long as it's American influence and American ideas and American dollars, I say let's do it the American way.

Sometimes there's almost an impossible choice. Sometimes point 4 will be brought to a country where it's difficult, terribly diffi-

cult, for a representative of the American Government or a person carrying an American passport to promote the kind of project that the great bulk of Americans would believe in. It is difficult because it would bring revolutions and the local governments would be opposed to it. But there are many places where you can do it. And I say, by and large, it would be a good idea to keep out of the places where you can't do it.

Let me tell you about Mossadeh in Persia. I should say parenthetically that he's a personal friend of mine, and I have a great admiration for him. When he left this country in November, empty-handed, I was sad with him because of the tragedy of the situation. The British said, "He won't last 3 months as prime minister. We have a prime minister we'll put in when Mossadeh falls."

You know what has happened in Persia? Since December when Mossadeh returned, 80 seats have stood for election in the parliament—80 seats out of 136. How many do you think Mossadeh got? Seventy-five. You know the province up on the Russian border called Azerbaijan—the troublesome province that was under a Soviet-controlled government about 1945? How many seats do you think Mossadeh got from Azerbaijan? He got all of them. He was opposed on all sides by two groups: the British and landlord groups and the Communist group. The Communist group out of 2,000,000 votes got 25,000 votes; but out of the first 80 candidates, the Communists in Persia didn't get a single candidate into the parliament. I say a man who can control a country at the polls like that is a strong man. I say he's a man who should be respected and supported.

Do you know what Mossadeh's program is? His domestic program? Mossadeh, by the way, is a wealthy man; he's an aristocrat. He's not a Communist—needless to say. Mossadeh has a land program that calls for the break-up of the feudal estates of Persia, for a sale of that land to the peasants, so that Persia will have the kind of land program that we, thank God, have had in this country, even before the Civil War, when all the land of the West was opened to our people and nobody got too much. Mossadeh would limit the holdings in Persia. The land problem, as your panel has said, is the heart of the problem of Iran as well as it is in other parts of the Near East. Mossadeh is out to solve it. Mossadeh in Persia presents an opportunity—an opportunity that is rare because there aren't many political leaders that you can back in the Middle East because they're largely the status quo group, the feudal group, the landlord group. And why spend American taxpayers' money financing them?

Let me tell you about the composition of the new Persian Parliament today. This is a grass-roots parliament; it represents a revolution come to the Middle East. That is something that has never happened in the history of the Middle East—a grass-roots parliament, as a result of a free election. Why? Because every goat herder in Persia loves Mossadeh and believes in him, just like the people in this country—most of them—loved F. D. R. Among the 75 new members of the Majlis are three professional politicians, 25 small landlords, 35 intellectuals. I suppose that would include most of us. There are six clergymen; there are two trade-unionists, and there are three small-business men. There are still 56 seats to stand for election, and I predict that Mossadeh will bring in 110 of the 136. Even though he doesn't, he already has 75 out of 136, which is pretty good by American political standards, and even with that Mossadeh may get through his land reforms. And so I think we should be supporting

Mossadegh, because those opportunities don't come very often in the Middle East.

We in America have great technical skills. We can produce machinery; we can produce a material civilization. But I imagine that Russia could do about as well as we could do at that level. I don't underestimate the tremendous power of our technical capacity and the importance of the material civilization that we have and its significance in terms of employment and the comforts of life and our standard of living. But I hate to think that America will go down in history as the Nation that made the first atomic bomb or had the finest bathrooms or the greatest television sets or the fastest motor cars. Surely, America should be remembered and measured by things more important than that. What is this thing, America—what is this thing in your hearts and souls—what is it? Is it this microphone—is it the thing we can put up and see and look at? I don't believe so. I think that this thing of America is the thing that we put into the Declaration of Independence. It wasn't written just for ourselves. Abraham Lincoln didn't think so. Abraham Lincoln when he was running for some office in Illinois about 1856 made a wonderful speech in which he said the Declaration of Independence was designed not for Americans alone but was a document that would inspire other people to shake the weight and burdens from their shoulders the world around—the people of all races and all tongues. That's the idea of America we should spread abroad. That is the idea of America that I think is real and vibrant. America stands for freedom. America stands for independence. America stands for justice. Not justice in the landlords' sense; not justice in the French or the British or the Dutch or the Russian colonial sense—but justice in the American sense.

Why did we refuse to put Tunisia on the agenda of the Security Council? Why do we refuse to give these little people of the world a hearing? What is this thing that we have created? Do we believe in the righteousness of power? I thought we believed in the power of righteousness.

Well, that's point V. How are you going to go to the world with point VI? If we can go to a region in India where there is an equitable distribution of the land, where there is opportunity for the common man, and tie into that program—then we are promoting the American ideal—then we are identifying ourselves with the peoples of the world in their aspirations—then we're making impossible this crude, this crass, this dismal thing known as communism.

If we go to a region to make a group of landlords richer, then we are promoting the thing that at home we hate.

If we go to Persia and back Mossadegh with point 4, giving him wholehearted support, then we're promoting the cause of the civilization that we believe in—then we're promoting freedom, justice, and opportunity, and dignity for the common man. Those who oppose him, who allne themselves with the forces that would destroy him, are conspirators to turn the Middle East into a Russian concentration camp.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you and I tonight were in Persia, we'd be for Mossadegh 100 percent. If we were in India, we might not be for Nehru 100 percent, because Nehru has been compromised by reason of his position in the Congress Party—though we'd be for him about 90 percent. If the conditions existed in America that exist in the Middle East and Asia, we tonight would be forming under the auspices of your chairman an American revolutionary committee—a committee to promote a revolution—to lead a revolution—to destroy the octopus that was overpowering us. The proudest thing in our history is the American Revolution. The

ideas that it espoused are ideas that spinned throughout the world. Point 5 is the American Revolution. Let's make it a good revolution. Let's put our ideas behind it and a few of our dollars. The funny thing about it is that if you've got some good ideas, you don't need much financing. It is the lousy ideas that require a lot of money.

Ideas are very dangerous; ideas have no boundaries—no state lines, no national lines, no oceans. They're powerful—the most powerful things in the world today. A few simple, good, old-fashioned ideas from the Declaration of Independence coupled with a fair portion of point 4 can stem the political tide of communism. Take all the American money that you can collect and all the guns and all the atomic bombs and keep your program sterile of these ideas of freedom and justice and opportunity—and the Red tide of communism will roll on and on and on. And that's what it's doing today. You can't stop it by talking about democracy and peace. You have to talk about it in terms that are understandable at the village level. We can't do that unless we are prepared to go into the villages of Asia and the Middle East with a program of political action. If you can't go in that way, stay out. When you go in, go in wholeheartedly in the American way. With a few dollars and a few great ideas, you can save the world from this horrible specter of Soviet imperialism.

You know, the Persians have a legendary character they call Mullah Nasr-ed-Din. He dates back to about the 12th Century; he's legendary. He's a character that Irvin S. Cobb and Will Rogers and some of our other American humorists would have enjoyed knowing. When you go into the villages of Persia, you pick up a lot of his stories. Some of them you have to clean up a bit and others are all right as they are. They nearly always start out with Mullah and a donkey. One day he was going down the road with donkey; and this donkey was the slowest donkey in the Middle East. The day was hot, and Mullah got very discouraged about his donkey. Mullah, being a very ingenious person, always had something along to help him out. This time it was a bottle of turpentine. So he pulled out this bottle of turpentine and he applied it to the donkey, and the donkey immediately burst into a terrific spurt. It went so fast Mullah couldn't keep up with the animal. Mullah ran as fast as he could and still could not catch the donkey. So he pulled out the bottle of turpentine and put some on himself. Pretty soon Mullah passed the donkey. About that time they came to a village. The villagers rushed out and stopped the donkey and Mullah said, "For heaven's sake, don't stop him—stop me!"

Well, I think we've been stopping the wrong thing. I think that if we get behind Point V and put it together with Point IV, we can really start to see things happening to the Middle East and Asia.

IRRIGATION WORK IN CONNECTION WITH CHIEF JOSEPH DAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Earlier today the Senate passed Calendar No. 1975, Senate bill 2320, to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance there to from power revenues, and for other purposes. The House passed an identical bill, H. R. 6163.

Is there objection to the Senate reconsidering the vote by which it passed Senate bill 1975 and proceeding to the consideration of the House bill?

The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the Senate passed S. 1975, to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes, is reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6163) to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6163) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, calendar No. 1975, Senate bill 2320 is indefinitely postponed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to make a short statement with reference to the summary of the committee's recommendations to the Senate. The figures which I am about to give are not found on the first page of the report. The reason for it is that from a technical standpoint the figures on the first page represent the dollar situation. From the practical standpoint, that is not at all the situation.

Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to the third figure which is found on the first page of the report, \$8,234,586,286. That is the amount of cash actually recommended for immediate appropriation by the Senate. The committee found that there was no statutory authority for any action in connection with the defense-construction program, it being a program to be authorized by substantive legislation which is now in process of being enacted by Congress. As of a late hour last night it had not yet been enacted. Therefore the committee was compelled to eliminate from the bill \$2,046,499,840, which was in the House bill as it came to the Senate. The House had passed the necessary authorization and could properly handle the matter. The figure was eliminated from the Senate bill, although it is recognized that some action must be taken in that field, either on the floor, if the necessary substantive legislation can be cleared, or if not, in conference, when the matter will be at issue up to the amount of the House figure.

Mr. President, there is also authorized for later appropriation contract authority to the Atomic Energy Commission in the amount of \$2,068,800,000. Consequently the amount in issue before the Senate is \$8,000,000,000 plus, to which

must be added \$2,000,000,000 plus of defense contracts, to which again must be added \$2,000,000,000 plus, being the amount of the contract authority to the Atomic Energy Commission, the total being \$12,349,886,126.

I felt that the figures ought to be before the Senate because there will be references made to both items, and they would not be understood from the report as it stands.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator whether, instead of the amount stated on the first page, under "Amount of decrease recommended by Senate committee and Budget estimate," being minus \$5,633,342,403, it is really only \$1,200,000,000?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. That is the amount of the basic decrease recommended by the Senate committee from the request of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is also correct to say that when the two billion plus in military construction was taken from the bill it was because there was no statutory authority for it.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the bill is passed, the matter will be in conference and can come back to the Senate in the conference report as a legitimate item in the bill.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—District of Columbia," on page 3, after line 21, to insert:

CAPITAL OUTLAY, SEWER DIVISION

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay, Sewer Division," to remain available until June 30, 1954, \$1,200,000, including such additional amount as may be necessary for the preparation of surveys, plans, and specifications in connection with the construction of storm-water and relief sewers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter II—Legislative branch," on page 4, after line 18, to insert:

SENATE

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1953: To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1953, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police, \$156,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 3, to insert:

Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery of \$300 for each Senator and the President of the Senate for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, \$29,100, to remain available for obligation until January 2, 1953.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, referring to page 17 of the bill, line 13 "Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion," I note that the bill provides:

Appropriations available to the "Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion," for fiscal year 1952, shall remain available until September 30, 1952.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee how much our Government has spent on the White House since the renovation began.

Mr. McKELLAR. Approximately \$5,500,000.

Mr. LANGER. Is work still in progress on it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh no; the work is finished. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will look at the White House. I know he will feel very proud of it. It is the most beautiful palace in all the world. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will visit it and go through it. I believe he will find that the work that has been done on it has been done honestly and has been done faithfully, and I know he will be just as proud of it as I am.

Mr. LANGER. What is the reason for allowing the fund to remain open until September 30 of this year?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is for the use of the new President. Of course, there will be a new President.

Mr. LANGER. Not by September 30 of this year.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not believe he will come into office before that time. The Senator is right about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 5, line 3.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, between lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

SENATE

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For an additional amount for "committee employees", \$1,500; and effective on and after July 1, 1952, the compensation of the chief of staff, Foreign Relations Committee, shall be at the rate of \$13,146 a year so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the amendment would appropriate \$1,500, for an increase in the salary of the chief of staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I suggest that this man is very unusually able and efficient. Last year he was offered a position in the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State at a salary of \$15,000. I indicated to him that he was free to go, but I hoped he would not go, because of his efficiency and his ability. Mr. President, he turned down that position as Assistant Secretary of State, with an increase in salary, to remain with the Committee on Foreign Relations, and he is still with the committee.

He now draws the same salary that two of his subordinates, who are member of the staff, draw as salary. He is the chief of staff, and he ought to be paid more than his subordinates are paid.

I very much hope that most of the Members of the Senate know Dr. Wilcox and know how able, how loyal, how efficient, and how patriotic he is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment on page 5, after line 8.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, all of us who know Dr. Wilcox agree that he is an able and a splendid man. There is no doubt in the world about that.

On the other hand, there are 9 or 10 others who are in similar positions. It would not be fair to increase the salary received by Dr. Wilcox, without increasing the salaries received by the 9 or 10 others who occupy similar or corresponding positions.

So the committee felt that we could not agree to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the past, others have been paid higher salaries than that. The special committee to investigate crime paid one of its staff members a salary of \$17,500.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was a different sort of committee, and I had nothing in the world to do with that arrangement. I did not know about it until after it was done, and I did not approve it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the Senator's committee reported the bill appropriating those funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, we had nothing to do with that salary. The item we reported was one for a lump-sum appropriation, as I recall.

Mr. CONNALLY. Nevertheless, the committee had to consider the lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. As the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has stated to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee considered this matter. However, it should be realized that there are 13 regular committees of the Senate, and each of those committees is important. The clerks of those committee all have long experience, extending over many years.

For instance, the clerk of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Everard Smith, has served the committee for many, many years. He is an outstandingly efficient official. On many occasions the Appropriations Committee has wondered how it could pay him a larger salary, so as to reward him properly for his outstanding work. However, that never has been done.

Mr. McKELLAR. In fact, Mr. Smith worked until 4 o'clock this morning on this very bill. Not only has Mr. Smith served the committee for more than 30 years, but when the Republicans gained control of the Congress several years ago, at which time the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, he retained Mr. Smith. Why? Because of Mr. Smith's outstanding ability and out-

standing knowledge of the affairs of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I know that the chief of staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Texas is chairman, is a fine and an able man in every way; but he is not superior to Mr. Smith.

Mr. CONNALLY. We are not proposing an appropriation either for or against Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has nothing to do with this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. However, by means of the amendment, a request is made that the salary paid Dr. Wilcox be increased. If that were done, it would have the effect of taking Dr. Wilcox out of the class to which both he and Mr. Smith belong.

Mr. CONNALLY. Again the Senator from Tennessee is referring to a group of 13 persons.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say that I have a very high opinion of Dr. Wilcox.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do, too.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think Dr. Wilcox is an outstanding able man, and the Senator from Texas, of course, is justified in praising him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly, he is.

Mr. BRIDGES. On the other hand, we cannot break the precedent. If we did, this matter would be opened up to every Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, in that event each committee would feel that it was free to pay whatever salaries it regarded proper to its staff members. Certainly that is not the right way for the Senate to proceed.

If the Senator from Texas wishes to have the Senate increase the salary of each of the men in that group of 13, so as to give each of them a fair increase in salary, that would be a different proposition, although even then I would not vote for it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas would not vote for that?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. However, if we are to be fair, we must treat each one of those persons alike.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yet the Senator from Tennessee just suggested to me that I do something for which he would not vote, and which he would oppose. That is a great position for a leader to take, Mr. President! [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have submitted this amendment to the committee amendment in all good faith and all good humor. But immediately I find that I have to fight Mr. Smith.

I think well of Mr. Smith. He works hard and diligently. On the other hand, this amendment does not relate to him.

If the Senator from Tennessee thinks as much of Mr. Smith as he says he does, why does he not vote to raise Mr. Smith's salary, and why does not the Senator from New Hampshire aid the Senator from Tennessee in raising Mr. Smith's salary?

Dr. Wilcox is in a category by himself. He was offered a position in the State Department—the position of Assistant

Secretary of State, with a salary of \$15,000. But he turned that down, because of his loyalty to the committee and his desire to continue with the committee.

Dr. Wilcox lectures all over the country. He lectures at Harvard University and other great universities, by invitation, because they know of his outstanding ability.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator from Texas think that Dr. Wilcox holds as eminent a position today, as director of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, as he would hold as Assistant Secretary of State? [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, that is another matter.

In any event, Dr. Wilcox did not accept the position he was offered in the State Department.

I should hate to think that anyone from New Hampshire would turn down a \$15,000 salary, when he was being paid only \$11,000. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that when I came to Congress I left a very much larger income than the one paid to me either as a Member of the House as a Member of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, I know that. On the other hand, what the Senator from Tennessee left when he came to Congress was not a salary. In Tennessee he was being remunerated for his loud voice before juries in Tennessee. So what he was receiving in Tennessee was not a salary. In Tennessee he was being paid separate fees for separate legal services.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator from Texas please not to talk about that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee himself brought it up. He injected himself into this discussion. He said, in effect, "The Senator from Tennessee was making a great deal more money in Tennessee than he was paid as a Member of Congress when he came to Congress." He said, in effect, "I am a patriot, and I surrendered a large income when I came to Congress to serve my country."

That is true, and I congratulate the Senator from Tennessee. He was a great lawyer and a great citizen before he came to Congress to serve first in the House of Representatives and subsequently in the Senate.

However, all that has nothing whatever to do with Dr. Wilcox and his salary.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the Senator from Texas will admit that the Nation has benefited very much by the services of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly the Nation has benefited very much by his services. I think the Senator from Tennessee has rendered to the Nation outstanding services.

I simply said that the Senator from Tennessee was a great patriot and a great lawyer and a great Senator and a great friend—and a great apologist. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not recall that I said very much about apologizing.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the Senator from Tennessee apologized for his committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; I will always do that—and I apologize to the Senator from Texas.

But the Senator from Texas has asked us to do something that the entire committee refused to agree to do.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not one member of the committee agreed to do it.

I am sorry we could not agree to do it; I apologize for not being able to do it. But we could not do it, and we cannot do it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry, of course. I regret being steamrolled. I thought that was confined to Chicago. [Laughter.]

But I do not mind being steamrolled. The Senator from Tennessee has great influence; he goes around among his fellows and lines them up and issues an edict and a ukase, and they fall into line.

But I shall not press the matter any further. The Senate can do as it wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to the committee amendment on page 5, after line 8. [Putting the question.]

The amendment to the committee amendment is rejected.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, after line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 5, after line 9, to insert:

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Committee on Appropriations Resolution No. 11, adopted by the committee on July 2, 1952, \$500,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. I regret to find it necessary to oppose an amendment in this appropriation bill which has been passed on by the full Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am surprised to find this particular amendment in the bill. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, yesterday, all day, and until 11:20 last night, I sat in the committee, helping to mark up the bill which now is before the Senate. After the bill had been completed—that is, all of the provisions of the bill, as it came to us from the House of Representatives—at that late hour I stepped just outside the committee chamber to answer the telephone. I was not gone 5 minutes. When I returned, after completing the call, the committee had adjourned. I did not know this provision was in the bill until this morning.

Mr. President, this is a most unusual provision. It emanates, under the circumstances, from a most unusual source. This is an amendment placed in the bill by the Senate committee, to give to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives \$500,000 in order to increase their staff. I am sure that intrigues Senators. It begets an interest to know why such a thing should happen. I will tell you, Mr. President, why. It is because this is part of the scheme to defeat a bill which is now being considered on the floor of the House, under a rule to take it up, at this moment, as I am speaking. It is a companion bill to the bill the Senate passed some months ago, Senate bill 913, to create a Joint Committee on the Budget, and to have a joint staff assisting in the work. That is the truth about it. Here we have the situation of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, who has probably been the chairman for 20 years, decides at the last minute, after this bill had passed the House, and after every appropriation bill, including the regular appropriation bill, had passed the House, at the eleventh hour, sending a letter to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, at 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon, asking the Senate to provide for them \$500,000. For what purpose?

I have the resolution, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with the House proceedings of yesterday. At the eleventh hour, hoping to stave off favorable action on the bill that is now on the floor of the House, or regarding which there is a motion pending to take it up, he calls the committee together, and the committee adopts a resolution, which will be found on page 9001 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, reading as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the following sum—

Then follows a copy of this amendment to this appropriation bill.

Mr. President, let us consider the purpose of it. I shall refer to a statement by Representative MAHON, who sought to call up the resolution for consideration yesterday afternoon, in response to a question by Representative TABER. The Speaker asked, "Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?" Mr. TABER then asked:

Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this resolution provides the Committee on Appropriations with funds, which in its opinion, are absolutely necessary to make the proper study and examination of the budget so that we can be prepared when the next session begins to hold the hearings in a satisfactory manner; is that not correct?

To which Mr. MAHON replied:

The gentleman is correct; it is for the purpose of implementing the staff on the Committee on Appropriations, and enable the Congress to do a better job in scrutinizing the budgets and investigating expenses of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to say to the Senate that last night, a few moments before we finished with the bill, a letter came from Representative CANNON, which was handed to me. The letter is addressed to me, and in it he said:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Appropriations of the House has approved an item of \$500,000 for additional investigation work by its staff, but there will be no further appropriation bills considered by the House prior to adjournment. Therefore, it will be appreciated if the Senate will include in the supplemental appropriation bill now pending in your committee, the following provision—

He then states that provision. I submitted it to the committee. I was told that it had long been a rule in the Senate not to object to appropriations requested by the other House for the work of their committees.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Also, that the House, on the other hand, does not object to such appropriations for the Senate. That was the rule, as I remember it.

The committee, I believe without much discussion, listened to a brief statement by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He referred to an unwritten rule to the effect that each House of the Congress shall determine what moneys it requires.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I say most respectfully, I agree with that rule, as a general principle; but when it is used as a device in an attempt to defeat proposed legislation which is now before the House, and at a time—it was the eleventh hour—

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, it was.

Mr. McCLELLAN. After they had had 20 years to figure out whether they needed more money, and had not included it in an appropriation, at the eleventh hour they ask the Senate to take up the cudgels for them, under those circumstances, I do not believe the rule applies.

Mr. McKELLAR. I recall that it was about 11:30 when the letter was received, and the provision was included in the bill, as I have related.

As the Senator from Arkansas knows, I am thoroughly in accord with the amendments to this bill which he has offered, and I expect to continue to support them. I do not know whether there is any method of preventing the Senator's amendment from being adopted. If there is I shall not be a party to it. The Senator knows that to be so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. When this matter came before the Appropriations Committee, late last evening, the Senator from Michigan, I think, sensed what had happened in the House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I suggest that the Senator from Michigan did not know until the last moment that any such request was pending. Is that not correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I sensed what was happening in the

House, and I felt that this was a means of accomplishing a purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. During the time the bill has been pending in the House of Representatives, they have taken the position that they did not need additional help for the Appropriations Committee, that they were doing a job. Yet, at the last moment, do Senators know how much they want? I did not finish what I was reading. The minimum would be 20 additional staff members, \$500,000. If it has to be done that way in order to have the Appropriations Committee adequately staffed, I would not object. But I want to say that if we include \$500,000 for the House Appropriations Committee, then I am going to propose an amendment, at this point in the bill, to add \$500,000 for the Senate Appropriations Committee, so that both the committees may function properly.

Mr. FERGUSON. I urged that last night. I suggested that if we were going to include \$500,000 for the House, we should include \$500,000 for the Senate. So that, if provision is not made for the joint committee—which I favor—as the bill of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas proposes, then we ought to provide in this bill such a sum as we may require.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true; and that is no reflection in any manner or form upon the present committees, or upon the staffs. It is simply indicative of the fact that this Government has grown, and that its expenditures are so heavy that we cannot possibly do all the things that should be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is necessary that we either have a joint staff or have several staffs.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the point. We are always telling the executive agencies that they are duplicating functions and hiring too many people. We get after them about it, and now we are preparing to set an example ourselves of hiring two people and spending two dollars where one would do.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we cannot have joint staffs, then we must have several staffs.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have an amendment prepared.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to join the Senator in it.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should first like to compliment the committee of which the Senator from Arkansas is chairman. I think the bill to which he has referred is without question the most important move toward Government economy that Congress has taken at this session.

I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that his bill passed the Senate by a large majority?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; and a motion is now being debated in the House to take up the companion bill.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true that this appears to be an attempt to sidetrack the bill and give the Appropriations Committee of the House enough money

to do the job without passing the McClellan bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think there is any doubt about it. It is too obvious.

Mr. MOODY. I am wondering if it would not be a wise thing to wait and see what happens to the McClellan bill in the House.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether the matter we have at hand came to the committee—I will say, in the first place, that I was not in the committee when the matter came up—

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think the chairman knew the request had been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was less than 5 minutes before we adjourned that the letter came.

Mr. CORDON. If the request comes to the Senate committee as the result of the passage of a resolution by the House—

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; not by the House.

Mr. CORDON. That is the information I desired to get and up to which I was leading.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects.

Mr. CORDON. The action taken on the House floor, as indicated on page 9002 of the RECORD, where Representative SMITH of Virginia objected to further consideration of the resolution, represents the last action of the House on this question, does it not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. An objection was interposed on the House by Representative SMITH of Virginia because he desired the House to consider the companion bill to that of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. A rule has already been obtained for the consideration of that bill, and it was scheduled to come up yesterday in the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator from Arkansas recall that shortly before 11 o'clock last night the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the junior Senator from Virginia left the meeting of the Appropriations Committee on the assumption that we had finished all the money items?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator misstates the facts. He was not informed that nothing else would be done. I do not like that kind of a reflection; I resent it. The Senator is not telling the truth.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, that statement is highly improper.

The Senator from Virginia said that the three Senators mentioned left the meeting about 11 o'clock under the impression that we had disposed of all the money items in the bill, and the remain-

der of the bill related to the employment of those who strike against the Government, Communist, and so forth. We left under that impression. That is a correct statement.

The Senator from Tennessee is quite out of order in the remarks he just made, and I am surprised that he made them.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Virginia was reflecting upon the chairman of the committee. He said the chairman assured Senators that there would be no money items brought up.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We did not ask the chairman about it at all. I merely said we left under that impression. We did not ask the chairman anything about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's words were words which he should not have used.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is a matter for the Senate to decide. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] I am sure will confirm the statement the Senator from Virginia has made. We did not ask the chairman whether he had 5 minutes' notice with reference to an item of \$500,000 for the Appropriations Committee of the House to duplicate what we had intended to have done under the McClellan bill. The junior Senator from Virginia hopes that we shall elect in November a President dedicated to economy. That will help solve the problem. If it does not solve it, we should proceed in a joint action and defeat the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. If this amendment remains in the bill, the McClellan bill will be offered as an amendment to the pending bill. We shall try to pass it and take it to conference, so it will be a part of this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand the matter which is now under debate on the floor of the House at this moment, the House will either vote to adopt the McClellan bill or it will not. My suggestion would be that we pass over, for the moment, consideration of this amendment, to see what the House does. If the House adopts by a yea-or-nay vote or any other method the bill, then, clearly, the situation will be different from what it was when we adopted the amendment in the committee. If the House refuses to pass the McClellan bill, we will be faced with another situation. My suggestion would be to pass over this amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to that at all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be clear and fair to the chairman of the committee, I should like to make a brief statement, because I attended the meeting from its start until the final adjournment. It is true that Senators were in and out of the

room during the course of the evening. It is quite possible that several of them may have left, and it may have been their impression that there was to be no other amendment.

I am quite sure, and can testify, that no statement was made by the chairman of the committee which would have led anyone to believe that no further amendments would be offered. When the matter did come to the attention of the committee, the chairman had the letter from Mr. CANNON read in full. It was discussed. The ranking Republican member of the committee was present and joined in the discussion, and raised some questions. Some of the other members joined in the discussion, and had some doubts. But finally I think the weight was given to the general theory that there is comity between the two Houses, and that normally, when one House has asked that something be included in a bill affecting that particular House, it is not questioned by the other House.

I quite agree with the point raised by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and some other Senators, that this is a slightly different situation, because instead of the provision having been put in the bill by action of the House, it came to us by way of a letter from the committee, rather than by action of the House.

However, I feel, in fairness to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], that I should personally testify that he certainly gave no impression that no further amendments would be offered. The matter was handled entirely in the above-board manner. It was subject to discussion in the committee. I desired to make that perfectly clear.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I join in every statement the distinguished Senator from California has uttered. No reflection on earth can be cast on our esteemed chairman. Everyone was tired. Some of us left under the impression that the meeting was concluded. I know that when I left I thought the meeting was adjourned. But as the chairman has said, the matter was called to his attention 5 minutes before adjournment. He himself did not know the letter was there. I did not know it was there. No other member knew it was there.

I take the position that the circumstances are most unusual. It is doubtful, in my mind, that the rule of comity should apply, as a matter of equity and right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to take exception to what the Senator from California has said. The Senator from Virginia never has said that the chairman of the committee said there were no further amendments to be offered. I never intended to imply that the chairman had even intimated that to us. All the Senator from Virginia wished to say, without any reflection whatever upon our distinguished chairman, was that three of us left under the impression that we had finished all the money amendments, because there were no more written out in the bill. That is what the Senator from Virginia said.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I have been conferring with my colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan, and I should like to join with him in favoring the McClellan bill as a rider to the pending bill, unless we follow the suggestion made by the junior Senator from Michigan, made a few minutes ago, and made also by the senior Senator from Arizona, namely, that we hold the matter up until we learn what the House does about it, because it seems to me there is clearly an effort to bypass the McClellan bill. There was an overwhelming vote in the Senate in favor of the McClellan bill. I do not believe the Senate should permit this sort of thing to occur. It seems to me that the Senator from Arizona has made a very constructive suggestion, that we lay the matter aside until the House has had an opportunity to act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be temporarily passed over until such time as we know definitely whether the House will vote for or against the McClellan bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the request that the amendment be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 21, to insert:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND
NATIONALITY POLICY

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, including the objects specified in title IV of Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, \$75,000, of which one-half shall be available for payment from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half shall be available for payment from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of such committee or by any member of such committee duly authorized by the chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Department of Commerce—Civil Aeronautics Administration—Claims, Federal Airport Act," on page 7, after line 3, to insert:

For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport Act," \$1,235,887, to remain available until June 30, 1953, as follows: Municipal Airport, Tulsa, Okla., \$111,106; Orange County Airport, Orange County, Calif., \$53,604; Bakersfield-Kern County Airport No. 1, Kern County (Bakersfield), Calif., \$45,719; Municipal Airport, Bainbridge, Ga., \$54,196; Municipal Airport, Cleveland, Ohio, \$347,605; Municipal Airport, Beverly, Mass., \$40,258; Municipal Airport, Orlando, Fla., \$246,618; Municipal Airport, Fort Wayne, Ind., \$198,896; Municipal Airport, New Bedford, Mass., \$30,580; Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport, St. Louis, Mo., \$25,409; Municipal Airport, Grand Island, Nebr., \$71,617; Cape May County Airport, Cape May County, N. J., \$10,279.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Treasury Department—Coast Guard—Operating expenses," on page 8, line 6, after the word

"expenses", to strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert "\$5,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Retired pay," on page 8, line 12, after the word "pay", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$625,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government corporation—Reconstruction Finance Corporation—Administrative expenses," on page 8, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$14,500,000" and insert "\$16,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter V—Department of Labor," on page 9, after line 18, to strike out:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount which may be expended for one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) carried under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby increased from "\$3,000" to "\$5,000."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a grave injustice, and I ask Senators to listen to me momentarily. A great injustice was done by the Committee on Appropriations last night, I am sure inadvertently, in the consideration of this particular item. The item is in the Department of Labor appropriation, in the Office of the Secretary. The House bill contained the following language:

Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount which may be expended for one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) carried under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby increased from "\$3,000" to "\$5,000."

That is the point. That automobile is intended for the head of the Department. He is a Cabinet officer of the United States. The Senate has approved other appropriation bills during this session. Only last night we approved the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The same kind of language, with reference to a Cabinet officer, was in that bill, and it was approved by the Senate. Last night the Senate also approved the appropriation bill for the Post Office Department.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The regular appropriation bill covering the Department of Labor was presented this year, and it was passed; was it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORDON. The opportunity to have this situation taken care of was in the consideration of the regular bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly it was through the neglect of the chairman of the subcommittee that that was not done. Nevertheless, merely because the regular bill did not provide for this item, I appeal to my good friends not to base their action on that failure. I know they are ambitious, and I know that they feel, down in their hearts, that there might be a possibility that there will be Cabinet officers from the other side of the aisle.

That is all right; but I know they are going to be mistaken about it. Nevertheless, ambition is always eternal, and the hope is there.

This is my idea. Do the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] feel that if that accident should happen, and a Cabinet officer should be named from the party on the other side of the aisle, the Postmaster General should ride in a \$5,000 car, while the Secretary of Labor, in whom I know they are deeply interested, should ride in a \$3,000 car? I ask for fair play.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that what has happened can be explained, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Secretary of Labor, or someone in his Department, saw in one of the appropriation bills that another Cabinet officer was getting a \$5,000 automobile, so they came before the committee when the committee was considering a deficiency or a supplemental appropriation bill and wanted to be certain that they got in on the kill. So they want to have a \$5,000 automobile. It is a matter of keeping up with the Joneses.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I could not adjust myself to such a violent idea.

Mr. FERGUSON. How does the Senator think the item was included in the pending bill? Why did not the Department think of it when the regular appropriation bill was being considered, which was passed a few weeks ago?

Mr. CHAVEZ. For the same reason that those in the Department of Agriculture and those in the Post Office Department did not think of it.

I ask the Senator from Michigan in all sincerity, Are we so small in the Senate, is our country the kind of country—

Mr. FERGUSON. But this kind of item has no place in a deficiency bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No? Last night I almost had apoplexy—

Mr. FERGUSON. So did I.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Michigan actually voted for an increase. It was all right. It was necessary. It was reasonable. We all agreed with him. What was the name of that fish—lamprey?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was not an increase.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, no; it was just a little extra.

Mr. FERGUSON. There was an item in the bill as to which legislation had been passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But, believe it or not, the Senator from Michigan was for it. It affected the Great Lakes. I do not think he did it for that reason, but because it was a reasonable item, and a necessary item, we agreed with the Senator from Michigan that the item should go into the bill. I hope that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], to whom I am extremely devoted, will agree that the committee amendment should be defeated. I ask for a sense of fair play on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator know whether or not at this time the Secretary of Labor has a limousine?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know whether he has a limousine or a Ford. He has not talked with me. I have not seen him or discussed the subject with him. However, it seems to me that the amendment is unfair.

Mr. CORDON. The passenger vehicle is set out as one for replacement, so quite evidently there is no serious question involved. The item is small. I agree with the Senator that if there are to be \$5,000 automobiles for other Cabinet officers, we should not discriminate against the Secretary of Labor. There is no question about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator may recall that I voted against the amendment to strike out the language.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the committee out-voted me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us be fair. The greatest characteristic of the American is fair play, and that is what I am asking for. I have not talked with the Secretary of Labor. I have not discussed the subject with him or with anyone else from that particular department. I learned during the day that in the bill for the Department of Agriculture and the bill for the Post Office Department, this allowance was increased to \$5,000.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does this item involve a Cadillac automobile which is being eliminated because the Secretary of Labor cannot ride in that kind of limousine?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I did not get the question.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am asking the question plainly and bluntly. Does this mean that we are eliminating an opportunity for the Secretary of Labor to ride in a Cadillac, while the heads of other departments and other Cabinet officers ride in Cadillacs? Perhaps we have too many Cadillacs. I am inclined to believe that we have.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason I am trying to defeat this amendment is that I want to be fair. It so happens that at the present time the Secretary of Labor is a member of the party represented by this side of the aisle. That is only incidental.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that Members on the other side of the aisle are ambitious. I want to give them a break when they appoint someone who they think is friendly to labor. I would not like to see the day come when the Postmaster General, even if he came from the other side of the aisle—and I know that some pretty good men are going to be disappointed because they will not have an opportunity to be Postmaster General—is to be subjected to a change in this item. If an accident like that should

happen, if the American people, in their bad judgment, should decide that a change should be made, I want every Cabinet officer treated in the same way.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot understand why the Senator takes up all this time looking at us and pointing his finger in this direction. The Senator has the votes on the other side of the aisle to defeat this amendment. He had the votes last night. There is a majority on the Senator's side of the aisle. His party has a majority on the committee. Let the Senator point his finger in the other direction. He has the votes over there.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only trouble with my friend from Indiana is that he does not realize that my finger is not one of scorn. My finger is one of friendship. I want to inform my friends on the other side just exactly what this amendment means. I ask for fair play.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without wishing to pour oil on the flames, is it not true that while nominal control of this body seems to be on this side of the aisle, the real control is in a bipartisan alliance between certain Democrats and the majority of Republicans?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In this instance I want a bipartisan alliance. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9 after line 18.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move, on page 10, line 6, to strike out the figure "\$6,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$6,500,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment is not in order. The Senate is considering committee amendments first. That is an amendment to the text.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. What I wish to do is to add some language to this paragraph. Would not that be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No amendments to the text of the bill are in order until the committee amendments are first disposed of.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 11, after line 4, to strike out:

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Payments to school districts," \$11,570,000.

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the able chairman of the committee just why lines 5, 6, and 7 are stricken out. They carry an appropriation of \$11,570,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The majority of the committee voted against me. That is why.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am wondering why the committee eliminated the entire amount rather than to make a possible reduction.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I wish to have something to say about this amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield to the able Senator from Alabama. After he has concluded, I should like to say something.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think the committee amendment in lines 5, 6, and 7, on page 11, should be rejected. The committee worked hard. In my long years in both House and Senate I have never known any committee to work more diligently and persistently or harder than the committee worked on this bill. But it was not possible to have hearings on this particular item. We reached the item rather late last night. We remained in session until practically midnight, under the leadership of our very fine, hard-working chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. At that time we did not have full information on this item.

Since the committee acted upon the item last evening I have endeavored to investigate the subject. As I say, I think the committee amendment ought to be rejected.

This is a typical deficiency item, a typical item for this kind of bill. Senators will recall that some 2 years ago, after the conflict started in Korea, Congress passed an act, Public Law 874, of the Eighty-first Congress, authorizing appropriations to help school districts in federally impacted areas—in other words, where the Federal Government, because of our defense situation, has been forced to go into a school district and there take over a great amount of land, which means that such land is no longer subject to taxation, or bring in a great many people, which means also bringing in a large number of children who must go to school and be educated. The Federal Government has created a situation in which the local school districts cannot provide teachers and the schools for the new children who come into the local school districts. The Congress, under Public Law 874, provided for Federal aid. In order to carry out the entitlements under Public Law 874 it is necessary that this deficiency appropriation of \$11,570,000 be made at this time. If Senators will look at the amendment they will notice that it states:

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "payments to school districts," \$11,570,000.

The school districts have hired teachers and made other expenditures. They have made commitments of various kinds, feeling that they had their entitlements under Public Law 874, which the Congress had passed, and that they had a right to expect Congress to carry out that law and grant them the entitlements provided under that law, because as I say, the situation has been brought

about by action of the Federal Government.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The distinguished Senator from Alabama has stated that the appropriation was to provide payment for expenses in the present fiscal year. I am sure he meant for the fiscal year which expired on June 30, with reference to expenses which had been incurred during that fiscal year.

Mr. HILL. That is what I emphasized. I emphasized fiscal year 1952, which expired on June 30. That means that the school districts, as I said, have made these obligations, these contracts, and these commitments, by virtue of Public Law 874, which granted them these entitlements. We would simply carry out what the Federal Government had promised to do.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that if the money is not provided, the school districts will be left short with reference to the commitments which they have made for the fiscal year and will find themselves unable to meet those commitments?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. Having acted under the law and under the entitlements, they will be left short.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to argue the question, because it is a clear issue. It would be palpably unfair to the school districts if we did not grant the money. I merely wish to ask one question. Is it not a fact that when the issue was presented to the House on the floor, the provision with reference to \$11,000,000-plus, for the maintenance of the schools in these critical defense areas, was adopted by a vote of 6 to 1?

Mr. HILL. As I recall, the vote was overwhelming. In the subcommittee, of which I am a member, the vote was overwhelming.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. We have in the State of Maryland at least four cases in which school districts that have obligated themselves with reference to maintenance and operation of schools would find that they had no money if the provision were stricken from the bill. It would be very embarrassing to them. I understand the provision was put in the bill by the subcommittee, and at the last minute stricken out by the full committee.

Mr. HILL. The money was put in by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was put in on the floor of the House.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it was added on the floor of the House, on the basis of facts which the Senate Committee on Appropriations did not have before it last

night. We must keep faith with those entitlements.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I certainly agree with the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be very brief. The Senator from Alabama is very familiar with the operation of the entire program. Is it not correct to say that the additional burdens imposed on virtually all the school districts by virtue of the Government activities are far in excess of the amount of money Congress provides to the districts?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. Congress does not undertake to meet the whole cost. It merely helps. If anyone doubts that fact he should read Public Law 874, of the Eighty-first Congress. Congress only helps with a part of it.

Mr. STENNIS. In many cases where the burden has increased from 35 to 40 percent the Federal contribution does not run to more than 7, 8, or 10 percent.

Mr. HILL. As a general proposition the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I am very glad he has raised the question. Some of the questions and the replies to them which have been made during the colloquy have answered most of my questions. I do wish to suggest, however, that the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from Oklahoma have pointed to a very important situation. The fiscal year has closed. Many of the schools in the defense areas have suffered the impact of the situation which has come about in defense areas, and they have relied upon representations heretofore made. Action which would deny help to meet to some extent the impact would be tragic, in my opinion.

In the city of Wichita, Kans., approximately from 35,000 to 40,000 persons have moved into town in the last year and a half, by reason of defense industries, with the result that the school facilities have become completely overtaxed. Some of these schools are located on property owned in fee by the Federal Government. To cut the funds will absolutely cripple not only the situation in Wichita, but many other situations all over the country. I certainly think that in all equity and good conscience we should remedy that kind of situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The ground on which the items were stricken out—not only the one with reference to the school districts, but the other items on the succeeding page as well—was because there was no evidence before the committee concerning the subject. Is that credit?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. We did not have any evidence before us.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Alabama is supplying the evidence, so far as I am concerned. As the Senator knows, I voted against striking it out.

Mr. HILL. The Senator certainly did.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. I bear witness to the fact that the Senator from Tennessee opposed the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee voted to strike it out last night—although I voted against striking it out—merely because no evidence was presented before the committee. We had to act hurriedly, as we have had to act hurriedly on many other bills, but it was agreed that if we struck it out it would go to conference and that would give us time to act intelligently.

In line with what the distinguished Senator from Kansas has just stated, many of these districts have made their plans and let contracts for the next fiscal year on the basis of the law. Therefore they must have some help from the Federal Government in order to carry out their school program.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is certainly true with reference to the two contiguous counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in Maryland. They have obligated themselves upon the faith of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe that the amount on line 7, \$11,570,000, is possibly the proper amount. I hope the Senate will retain that amount. The \$80,000,000 in line 10 could well be cut to \$50,000,000.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that that is not the amendment we are discussing.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in favor of restoring the \$11,570,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. The Senate must be in order. It is impossible to hear what is going on in the Chamber.

Mr. HILL. Although I have the floor, I shall ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Security Agency and Labor Appropriations, who normally handles these appropriations, to make a statement at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Before I do, I believe the Senator from Washington wishes to ask a question.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I have not had an opportunity to hear all of the colloquy, and therefore I have but a single question. Is it the intention of the committee that the money in question will be used by

American municipalities and States to help them solve unexpected and unavoidable problems which have been imposed upon these local levels of government because of the defense effort and emergency in which we find ourselves?

Mr. HILL. I will say to my good friend that that is exactly what the money is for, namely, to help local school districts. The money goes to the local school district to help that local school district meet an emergency situation which comes out of the fact that the Federal Government has come into the local district and taken a great deal of land from the tax rolls and has brought in a great number of additional children who must be educated in the local schools.

Mr. CAIN. It is not a Federal contribution to be of assistance to any normal school situation?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; it is only to be applied where there is a federally impacted local school district.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With reference to what the Senator from Washington has stated, let me say that in my State we have a situation in which more than 3,000 school children have been brought in by the Army and Air Force in an area which is not near a school, and the local school district must take care of those children.

Under this bill they would receive approximately \$34,000 with which to take care of thousands of school children of Army and Air Force personnel. We have assured them that we would provide these funds, and they have proceeded on the basis of the public law authorizing this program. They have done their part. They have finished the job for the fiscal year which already has ended.

So, Mr. President, unless this money is appropriated now, we shall be breaking faith.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, let me say that there is a similar situation in the State of Washington. I wish to make certain that the money proposed to be appropriated will be used for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Washington is absolutely correct about it. This money will go to the local school districts in which there exist such a situation, growing out of these developments.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if it is true that many of the areas which will be affected by this amendment are sparsely settled areas, areas with a small population—areas such as at least two on the coast of North Carolina, one of them being Camp Lejeune, where 50,000 marines were brought into a county which had a population less than half that number to begin with. Those marines, together with their wives and children, are located there. Unless

this provision is made, the children of those marines will lack the necessary school facilities, and will have to go without them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina for the statement he has made. He has clearly stated the situation underlying the authorization which heretofore has been made, and he has clearly stated the need today for the appropriation we request.

Into certain areas more children have been brought as a result of orders of the Federal Government than the number of children who normally live there, whose homes are located there. In such cases the local school districts simply cannot make provision to educate all the children who have been brought into their areas.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. That is true in at least several areas in North Carolina, which had such a sparse population to begin with that the number of persons brought in, as a result of the activities of the Federal Government, far exceeds the native population. The result of such a development is to create an educational vacuum, one which is proposed to be filled by means of this amendment.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly the situation, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. The purpose of the amendment is to make certain that a serviceman who goes into such an area does not have to sacrifice the opportunity of his children to receive an education.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina is entirely correct. A marine who goes to Camp Lejeune and takes his wife and children there should have an opportunity to have his children receive a proper education while they are living there.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is the proposed appropriation of \$11,570,000 in accordance with the needs as set forth and the plan as provided for in the original bill?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Ohio is entirely correct.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to commend the Senator from Alabama for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

In my State, most of these districts—possibly there are as many as a dozen of them—are either in suburban areas, where the taxes are limited, and where the school districts are further restricted by the carrying out of the program of the Federal Government and the building of Federal institutions, or in the quasi-rural areas, where the local school districts could not possibly meet the expanded need for schools which has developed as a result of the activities on the part of the Federal Government.

As I understand, the appropriation now requested is to be used to make payments to teachers and for maintenance of the schools for the fiscal year which has just ended.

Mr. HILL. That is entirely correct.

Mr. BRICKER. So this appropriation, in effect, amounts practically to a moral

obligation, on the part of the Federal Government to the local communities, to carry out the provisions of the original bill.

Mr. HILL. It certainly amounts to a small obligation, in view of the basic act which we passed some 2 years ago, in which we said to the local school districts, "Go ahead and make your plans to educate these children; we are passing this law, granting you these estab-
 lishments."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I feel that it is necessary that this item be included in the bill, or else those schools will have to close or provide a very inferior quality of education.

Mr. HILL. That is entirely true, and I thank the Senator from Ohio very much.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS—AUTHORITY FOR REPORTING AND CONSIDERATION OF BILL

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at this time, to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose, provided it is understood that in so doing I shall not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may yield for that purpose without losing the floor.

Mr. HILL. Very well; I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, upon motion, House bill 8120 may be called up. It is the bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations. It is the so-called military installation authorization bill, to authorize construction for which appropriation items in the 1953 supplemental appropriation bill, House bill 8370, will be necessary.

In order that House bill 8120 may be called up tomorrow, even though the Senate does not take an adjournment today—because under the rule the bill would normally have to lie over for one day—I ask unanimous consent that that bill may be taken up on tomorrow, upon motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Reserving the right to object—although I do not intend to object—let me say that, as I understand, copies of House bill 8120 and copies of the report on it will be available tomorrow before the Senator from Louisiana makes a motion to have the Senate take up the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I expect to have both the bill and the report on it available either today or tomorrow, before the bill is taken up.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator would not want to have the Senate take up the bill before copies of the bill and copies of the report on it were available; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. They will be available at that time.

I make this request now, because it is necessary that House bill 8120 be con-

sidered and acted on promptly, for there will have to be a conference on that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the request of the Senator from Louisiana to be that he may be permitted to report House bill 8120 and to submit a report on it during the recess of the Senate, following the session today, and also that the Senator from Louisiana requests unanimous consent that the bill may be taken up tomorrow, upon motion. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I think there will be no objection to the procedure proposed by the Senator from Louisiana. In the supplemental appropriation bill for 1953, we have this \$2,000,000,000 construction item. Until we knew what action the committee took on the substantive authorization measure, we were compelled to eliminate, or at least we felt that we should eliminate, that item from the bill. We have done so.

If the agreement requested by the Senator from Louisiana can be obtained, it will be of value not only to the Senate, but also to the conferees, in case we cannot reach this feature of the bill when the measure reaches conference, and so enable Congress, before it adjourns, to provide funds with which to start this great construction program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Subsequently,

Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Armed Services, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 2078) thereon.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 11, striking out lines 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say to you, sir, and to my colleagues, that the appropriation here requested is intended, not to carry all the burden, but to supplement the expense to which these school districts are being put and have been put because of the conditions created by the Federal Government in sending into these areas military personnel and their wives and children.

The amount requested to be appropriated will be spent under the supervision of the Office of Education; and the amount received by each school dis-

trict will be in proportion to the number of children in that category who will be attending school there.

In my own State, there are 183 school districts that are educating children who live on or near such military installations. I shall not mention the camps by name; but these children are the children of fathers and mothers who went to those areas because the Federal Government wanted them to be there. They went there because the Federal Government put them there.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that most of these children are the children of laborers who are at such places because they are engaged in construction work there or defense work there. The parents of these children went there to do that work, and left their homes. The children involved in this matter are principally the children of such laborers who are constructing those plants or are operating those defense establishments.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is entirely correct.

Some of these children are the children of officers who are assigned to duty at these military posts. Those children have been uprooted from their homes and have been taken to those areas. They must have educational opportunities.

It is not just to impose on the local taxpayers in those districts the heavy burden of paying out of their own pockets for the education of those children—not their own children, not children who normally live in those districts, not the children of the normal population of those districts, but children who were "drafted," so to speak, and were put into those areas.

So I hope very much that the committee amendment will be rejected, and that we shall return to the provision voted by the House of Representatives.

The House overwhelmingly adopted that provision.

The Senate committee took the position that it had held no hearings on this matter and had no information about it. Of course, Mr. President, that is not the fault of the Senate. If our committee did not hold hearings, of course it could not obtain evidence or information simply by sticking its head out the window. If information is to be obtained, hearings must be held. However, the committee did not hold hearings. If the committee had held hearings, it would have obtained testimony from witnesses who would have reflected the views which are being reflected here in the Senate at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with reference to the hearings, it is correct to say that we had no hearings whatever, though today we received the information which is being so well announced to the Senate by the Senator from Texas. The conditions which exist in Texas are similar to conditions which exist in every State of the Union.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is some question about the fiscal year—the technical fiscal year. Today, was it 11:20 or 11:30 when the fiscal year expired? It makes no difference as to the fiscal year

in which the situation arises. If the Federal Government is responsible for this condition, it is responsible for correcting it. That is sound, is it not? Of course, it is. Money has been borrowed and contractual obligations have been incurred in reliance upon a law passed by the Congress which made it clear that it was our purpose to furnish these funds in a proportional manner. What difference does it make what it is one fiscal year or another? If I owe a note at the bank, I want to pay it, whether it is due or overdue. Usually, it is probably overdue. [Laughter.] I want it paid with interest. I do not want the Federal Government to put its iron hand upon the poor struggling people who live in the school districts, to make them pay money out of their own pockets for the education of children from all of the 48 States of the Union. The districts were not selected by the Congress. This is not a post-office patronage proposition. The Congress does not specify where the camps shall be located. The Government says, "We want to put some troops in your school district." The people are not asked for their consent; the troops are simply stationed there. But the troops are not stationed there with any receipted bills, representing payment for their education. The school districts are expected to educate them—not with Federal money, but with money out of their own pockets. It is not just; it is not fair.

I thank the Senator from Alabama, for having yielded. I hope the Senate will reject this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I would have been on my feet, except that I assumed the Senator from Texas was going forward with his argument. I desire to say a few words before we dispose of the committee amendment. I have no illusion about what is going to happen to it, but I have heard the statement made that the committee had no knowledge of the situation. I am not certain how much knowledge it had. I know how much it could have had. Information was available, part of it within the memories of members of the committee; and it should be within the memories of all Members of the Senate. I have no objection to deleting the suggested amendment of the committee, but I think we perhaps ought to clear the atmosphere a little bit, here. First, let us remember that this is a supplemental bill. A supplemental bill is at least presented on the philosophy that it represents appropriations, the necessity for which could not be foreseen when the regular bill was presented.

Mr. President, the regular bill for this item was presented in the 1952 Appropriation Act. It was argued at length upon the floor of the Senate. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, I recall, made a most impassioned presentation on this subject, one which was well documented, as did also the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and numerous other Senators. In other words, the Senate acted advisedly when it made an

appropriation of \$40,000,000 for this purpose. That \$40,000,000 represents 76 percent of the total authorized amount in the pending legislation. That was known last year. It was discussed on the floor of the Senate. In the preceding year, 1951—and that was shortly after the law had gone into effect, and when no local district had had any opportunity to do anything to meet this terrific added load—the amount provided was 96 percent. The House reported on the matter, I think, rather fully. The House indicated the percentage both in 1951 and in 1952. That is their position.

This provision represents their philosophy for what it is worth. Their philosophy was that over some period of time the local government ought to commence to make some preparation to take over a greater share of the cost of education within a given area. So far as I am concerned, I think that is fairly sound philosophy.

It was felt that this \$11,570,000, incidentally, would bring the appropriation for 1952—that is, for the year which closed on June 30—up to about 95½ percent of the total, the maximum amount authorized in the basic legislation. It was felt that there should be less appropriation this year than was made in the first year. I assume it was figured to make it less as the years went by.

It may well be that the \$11,500,000 is too heavy a cut for this year. I can understand how people feel who are in this situation. A similar one prevailed in World War II, in my own State, in two or three places, and it was desperate. We had no basic legislation. We had to operate under the Lanham Act. We did that. We still have such a condition in two or three places in Oregon, though not so bad as it is perhaps in other States. Over the years, of course, the local government accommodates itself to the situation. There is far more money released in the particular areas. There is more money with which to pay for education and so on.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I merely want to call his attention to Oak Ridge, Tenn., which was not even a village, or at least nothing more than a village, when the Government took it over entirely. It has grown to be the fifth largest city in Tennessee. It comes next to Knoxville, I believe, or Chattanooga. It would take 95 percent. The people who have come in there are more than 95 percent of the whole population.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I know the situation there, and of course, Oak Ridge is owned entirely by the Federal Government. There is no tax base there, but there is a very definite inequity. The people who live there are paid full salaries. They pay less rent than is paid anywhere else, and they do not contribute a thin dime toward the cost of educating their children, while all the other people of the United States do. That is wrong.

Mr. McKELLAR. Unfortunately, they have no rights as citizens. They have no local government at all. They have no mayor. They are governed by a company which is located in New York.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that the report of the House committee was available to the Senate, and that the record of last year's \$40,000,000 appropriation and all the facts were available. But I certainly can excuse the members of my committee for not informing themselves of the situation, because we were up against it. We did not have time enough to do much more than read the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that if it were not for the emergency of the situation we would have had witnesses come before us and testify.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. But we were in a situation, as the Senator says, where we could not do so.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. President, if the committee amendment be not agreed to, the amount of money provided under the act will be within one-half of 1 percent of the amount provided in 1951. It will be for last fiscal year, the year which closed on the 30th of June, for school charges already incurred, and it will be for charges incurred by districts which had notice before the beginning of this year and shortly after the beginning of the school of the amount of money to be furnished for 1952.

THE SCHOOLS AND CRITICAL AREAS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to say in support of the statement of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that if this appropriation were not made it would be a breach of faith with the schools of this Nation. These towns and areas, many of relatively small population, are supporting the children of the workers who have been sent into the national defense areas. This program has been established by Congress and if we cut down this appropriation at this time it would be a clear breach of faith on the part of Congress.

It is one of the most important items contained in this bill. We are committed to keep up the work so that the children of the servicemen and the children of construction workers in areas such as Henderson, Nev., where the population tripled during the Second World War, may be included in the program.

Congress has already set the precedent by its action and it is so obviously necessary and in the public interest that it hardly admits of argument.

With the national defense pressure continuing and with the industrial areas and airports becoming more important—it would be a clear breach of faith with the schools of such areas to discontinue such assistance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 7, to strike out:

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "School construction", \$80,000,000 to remain available until expended.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on page 11, line 10, I offer an amendment to strike out "\$80,000,000" and insert "\$60,000,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana offers an amendment—

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wonder if we could debate it before we vote on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator wishes to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to clarify the parliamentary situation. The Senator from Indiana suggests a reduction from \$80,000,000 to \$60,000,000. If his amendment is accepted by the Senator from Tennessee, does that of itself kill the amendment of the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it does not. The committee amendment would have to be rejected in order to make the \$60,000,000 available.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I assume it will be useless, but I desire to rise in opposition both to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Indiana and to any action against the committee amendment. This is a different picture altogether than was the amendment relating to \$11,500,000 for operating or assisting in paying the cost of operating schools. In this connection I want to read into the RECORD a statement from the report of the House of Representatives. I hope my colleagues will pay attention, because it is interesting, at least. This is what the House of Representatives had to say about an item of school construction:

The committee has disallowed all of the \$80,000,000 requested. The committee reduced the original request for 1953 by only 10 percent, from \$150,000,000 to \$135,000,000—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I cannot yield until I have concluded the reading from the House report. I read further—

and included language to make this amount available immediately upon passage of the act. The bill was passed by both the House and the Senate in exactly the form in which it was reported by the committee. The committee stated in its report on this bill "The committee wants it to be understood that this action does not in any way indicate that it will look favorably on a request for an additional amount in fiscal year 1953. The agency is expected to plan a program for the entire period from the enactment of this bill to June 30, 1953, within the funds provided." In the face of the action of both Houses of Congress and the very clear expression of the committee to the contrary, the Bureau of the Budget submitted a supplemental request for \$80,000,000 even before the beginning of the 1953 fiscal year. The justifications and verbal testimony were completely devoid of any new information which would justify this action.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will pay attention to this:

Neither the Federal Security Agency nor the Office of Education was consulted or given forewarning that this action was contemplated. The Federal Security Agency's budget officer said, somewhat in apology

for the physical form of the justifications, "This came so suddenly we didn't get the regularly prepared justification * * *." The principal witness who was forced into the position of attempting to defend the estimate said, "The first thing I knew about that, Mr. Chairman, was a telephone call last night that this might be up today." The committee is unaware of and does not seek to determine the motives behind this eleventh-hour proceeding, but certainly such hastily conceived action and flaunting of the obvious intent of Congress ill befits the office that is supposed to lead and set the example for the entire executive branch in the field of budgeting the public funds.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator has been reading from the House report?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that notwithstanding that committee report, the House itself, in its judgment, inserted \$80,000,000 as recommended by the Budget Bureau?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Its judgment was brought about as a result of the fact that the authority for the item is Public Law 815. According to the requirements under that law, the total estimate of need is \$559,642,044. Last year we appropriated \$146,000,000. In the regular bill this year we appropriated \$135,000,000, making a total amount already appropriated of \$281,000,000, with the \$80,000,000 recommended by the House in this bill, that will make a total of of \$361,000,000, when the need is \$560,000,000.

Even if we were now to appropriate \$80,000,000, we would still be \$240,000,000 short of the estimated needs. Could not the House have acted upon those figures?

Mr. CORDON. Undoubtedly the House acted as it did because it felt that there was need for that amount of money. I do not question that fact. I think there is need for more than that amount of money. There is need for millions of dollars in thousands of other situations in the United States. It is not pleasant to rise and oppose this sort of appropriation. But the brutal fact is that if we do not find some way of working down to where we can live within our means, we are going to need not only that \$500,000,000, we are going to need all the money that we can take from the taxpayer, and there will be no taxpayer to pay it.

In some way or other we shall have to do something to try to get down within our means. We cannot forever keep extending the debt structure. It seems to me that it should be apparent to everybody that when the President of the United States last year sent his carefully prepared budget to Congress, and we voted 90 percent of it, \$135,000,000 out of \$150,000,000, we could at least hope, even though it be an election year, that if he had to ask for a little more, he would not have asked for any more than the \$15,000,000 he did not get in his original budget.

But here is a request that was not asked for by either of the interested agencies. It came full-blown from the Bureau of the Budget to the House, and

the benefiting administering agencies did not know the Bureau of the Budget was even considering the matter.

The Senate can put its approval on that sort of sharp practice if it wants to. The Senator from Oregon is not going to join them. He will vote against the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. If the committee amendment is agreed to, would the amount all be stricken?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be if it were agreed to, including the \$60,000,000.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the committee amendment?

Mr. HILL. I shall take but 1 minute. I think the Senate ought to have the information I seek. I am referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday, June 27. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a statement by Representative BARDEN, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the committee which has given a great deal of time, study, and thought to the matter, the committee which has handled the legislation and has authorized appropriations to the Federal impacted areas. I shall not read Mr. BARDEN's entire remarks. I merely wish to call attention to these words which he spoke last Friday, just before the House acted to put \$80,000,000 in the bill:

Let us think a little, too, of the emergencies that exist and of the school construction that is absolutely necessary. There would have been considerably more money for use in other sections of this country had it not been for the construction of the Savannah River project.

We know what the Savannah River project is. It is the great atomic energy project on the Savannah River.

I continue to quote Mr. BARDEN:

There would have been considerably more money for use in other sections of this country had it not been for the construction of the Savannah River project which took a great amount of the money for needed school buildings that could have been used in this program for other areas. This amount of money, \$80,000,000, will close up the program. That is the general concession made by all.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and I also pay my respects to the Representative whom he was quoting, that that money was not spent in the Savannah Valley. We had to get money from other sources. We passed a sales

tax to operate the schools, and it was necessary to go even further than that, and to borrow funds, in spite of what the Representative said.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to have it understood that the Savannah River project had nothing to do with any money not being available for any other area.

Mr. KERR. If it is a fact, as my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina, has stated—and I know it is, because he has said it—that there were not Federal funds with which to meet the requirements in the area to which he has referred, it could only be because Congress has not appropriated enough money to meet the problem throughout the country in accordance with the spirit of the law which authorized the amount as set forth by the Senator from New Mexico a few minutes ago. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am asking the question of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that there was no one in South Carolina who got the money. When we asked for money, Congress did not appropriate it. The State itself had to raise funds. I want the Senator to understand that I am not opposing this program. I am simply disillusioned and disappointed that South Carolina has fared so badly under this program. I certainly hope that in the future, and in consideration of the sacrifices and the contributions made by the people of South Carolina to their country, that they will be able to share in the benefits of this Federal aid which they so badly need and richly deserve because of the Government's decision to build the Atomic Energy plant which has taken away more than 250,000 acres of our farm land and many of our historic landmarks.

The State levied a sales tax to provide for education. We do not desire Federal interference with our educational program. The Federal Government refused to help us when we needed money. I want no misunderstanding. This money certainly was not spent in the Savannah Valley.

Mr. HILL. Of course, we all share the view of the Senator from South Carolina. We want no Federal interference. But that does not mean that we have not put these enormous burdens on certain local school districts, and we have an obligation to go in and help the school districts carry the load which the Federal Government has imposed upon them.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is not this an appropriation that is intended merely to carry out the authorization which was made in view of the need for construction of schools in the local districts, without interference with the local districts, but

yet in a situation where the local districts had gone as far as they could in the matter of appropriating their own funds?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the question goes far beyond the needs of the Savannah Valley?

Mr. HILL. I would not want the Senate to think for one moment that it is a question of only the Savannah Valley. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I shall read another statement, which shows that there are many such school districts.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would the Senator be kind enough to state to the Senate how much the Savannah Valley will receive under this program?

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator that I do not have the figures.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the light of past experience, I would expect that the Savannah Valley will get very little, if any.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the amount in the bill, \$80,000,000, is calculated to take care of school districts in every State of the Union, among which are 250 within the State of Oklahoma, which are no more worthy than those of any other State, but they are themselves quite worthy and entirely unable to meet their requirements without this provision of the bill.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. What the Senator from Oklahoma has said is exactly what Representative BARDEN, of North Carolina, said, and exactly what Representative BAILEY, of West Virginia, who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without wishing to be impish—

Mr. HILL. It is impossible to conceive of so brilliant a statesman as the Senator from Illinois as an imp.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without wishing to be impish, could the slogan of some Senators be "No Federal interference, but lots of Federal money?"

Mr. HILL. No, I would say that all Senators stand for no Federal interference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But for lots of Federal money?

Mr. HILL. No; I would not say that. When the Federal Government has imposed a burden on a particular local school district, right and justice require that the Federal Government help carry the burden. That is what is here involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 11, beginning in line 8.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If a Senator wishes to vote for the \$80,000,000, he should vote "No," should he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. The result of the vote has been announced.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How can we transact business when a quorum is not present?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is always presumed to be present unless the point of no quorum is made. Furthermore, the Chair has already announced the result, and a quorum call would have no effect on the result. Does the Senator still wish to call for a quorum?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I may do so later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 10, to strike out:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For additional amounts for increased costs of pay and allowances authorized by Public Law 346, approved May 19, 1952, as follows:

"Venereal diseases," \$16,500;
 "Tuberculosis," \$23,250;
 "Assistance to States, general," \$37,500;
 "Communicable diseases," \$69,750;
 "Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene," \$61,500;
 "Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska," \$7,500;
 "Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services," \$9,000;
 "Hospitals and medical care," \$388,000;
 "Foreign quarantine service," \$15,000;
 "National Institutes of Health, operating expenses," \$48,750;
 "National Cancer Institute," \$25,500;
 "Mental health activities," \$16,500;
 "National Heart Institute," \$22,500;
 "Dental health activities," \$20,250;
 "Retired pay of commissioned officers," \$36,000;
 "Salaries and expenses," \$20,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Hospitals and medical care," on page 12, line 15, after the word "care", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 3, to insert:

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Soil conservation service

Water Conservation and Utilization Projects

For an additional amount for "Water conservation and utilization projects," \$190,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading, on page 13, line 11, to change the chapter number from "VI" to "VII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior," on page 13, after line 12, to strike out:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction," \$525,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That restrictions contained within the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952, limiting the amounts which may be expended from appropriations to the National Park Service for personal services, are hereby waived to the extent necessary to meet the costs of fire suppression and of emergency reconstruction or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 14, to insert:

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Investigations of resources," fiscal year 1953, \$240,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 5, to change the chapter number from "VII" to "VIII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices," on page 14, after line 6, to strike out:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

EXTRAORDINARY ALTERATIONS AND REPAIRS, EXECUTIVE MANSION

Not to exceed \$50,000 of funds made available to the President under the heading "Emergency fund for the President, national defense," contained in the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953," shall be available until June 30, 1954, for extraordinary alterations, repairs, furniture, and furnishings of the Executive Mansion and the White House Office, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Atomic Energy Commission," on page 15, line 15, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$35,000,000, of which \$30,000,000 shall be available only for the weapons program" and insert "\$141,188,000"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$25,064,275" and insert "\$30,755,526"; and in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,709,350" and insert "\$3,657,647."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 21, to strike out:

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment", including the purchase (not to exceed an additional 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$1,450,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancella-

tion costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "plant and equipment", \$1,450,000,000, of which \$1,355,398,000 is for (i) expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of \$3,518,800,000 for the foregoing purposes which the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to enter into pursuant to the authority of this act as necessary or appropriate to carry out the program as recommended by the National Security Council, approved by the President of the United States, and submitted to the Congress by the Atomic Energy Commission and (ii) settlement and payment of termination claims under such contracts if additional appropriations to permit continuation of performance under such contracts are not hereafter made: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs as provided in the contracts, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared as to the effect on the point 4 program in South and Southeast Asia of the amendment further reducing the MSA appropriation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE EFFECT ON THE POINT 4 PROGRAM IN SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIA OF THE AMENDMENT FURTHER REDUCING THE MSA APPROPRIATION

One of the most serious cuts made by the House of Representatives in the Mutual Security Program is in the provision for aid to South and Southeast Asia. The President originally requested \$176,000,000 for economic and technical assistance for India, Pakistan, Nepal, Ceylon, Afghanistan, Burma, and Indonesia. This was cut by a third in the authorizing legislation to only \$118,000,000. The House Appropriations Committee favorably reported this full figure but it was arbitrarily cut on the floor by \$50,000,000 to only \$68,000,000.

In South Asia, the greatest effects of the reduction will be in the India and Pakistan programs, both of which have been considered as minimum programs in the presentation to the Congress.

Our aid programs have been established within the framework of development programs which the governments of India and Pakistan have carefully worked up in order to increase the economic well-being of their people. The people of India and Pakistan have long waited for some perceptible betterment of their pitifully low standard of living. Now that they are enjoying the experience of political independence, they are anxious and determined to enjoy the economic fruits of that independence in more food, more clothing, better health, and better housing.

The economic goals desired by the Indians and Pakistanis will be attained by them with or without external aid, but the time of their attainment would be much slower without external aid and the political framework within which they would be attained might well be different if aid is not available. United States assistance can serve to speed up the economic development programs of these countries and thus help to convince their millions of people that the path of democracy and not of communism is the true road to economic salvation without loss of personal liberty.

It must be clearly understood that the United States has a great stake in the political path which the subcontinent selects to reach its economic aims. The Communist colossus to the north is bearing down with constant and increasing pressure of propaganda upon these new democracies. Its radios, its newspapers, its agents repeat the well-known Communist phrases of utopian promises and suggest that the economic ills of India and Pakistan can be solved only if these countries follow the methods which Soviet Russia and Communist China have used to attain their self-styled wondrous economies.

Time is of essence. The impatient and hungry millions of the subcontinent will not wait generations to reap the benefits of modern economic development. They want a higher standard of living and they want it soon. The present governments are committed to achieving perceptible results within the next 4½ years. But if the large Communist vote in south India during the recent election is any indication of a desire on the part of the people to achieve quick results, the achievements in the economic field in the next 4½ years by the incumbent democratic government in India may spell victory or defeat for the democratic forms in that great country. And if India falls, others will follow in her wake.

It is this urgency of time that has spurred the Governments of India and Pakistan to great efforts to achieve substantial results in the next 4½ years. It is this need for quick results which has guided United States planners in their program presentation to the Congress.

Let us consider these facts:

1. Every United States dollar contributed to India and Pakistan for economic development will be used for specific projects mutually agreed upon between the United States and the receiving country, and will be matched by the country concerned with local currency and in some instances with four to five times the dollar equivalent of the United States contribution.

The United States contribution is but a small fraction of what the countries themselves are spending for economic development. India, for example, intends to spend close to \$5 billions during a 6-year period while Pakistan plans to expend about \$800 millions over a similar period. Specifically, India intends to spend about \$700 millions in 1952 fiscal year and plans to spend over \$800 millions in 1952-53. Pakistan will have spent over \$300 millions for development during its fiscal year ending in March 1952 and plans to expend about \$330 millions during its 1952-53 fiscal year.

2. The standard of living in these countries is low by any standard; per capita real income in Pakistan is about \$50 per year and \$60 in India. Compare this with the average income in the more developed areas of the world of \$690 per person per year.

3. The most outstanding differences in the standard of living between India and Pakistan and other more developed countries is in food consumption. India affords its people on the average of 1,660 calories per person per day while the Pakistan figure is 2,030 calories. The more developed regions on the other hand, supply their people

with an average of 2,750 calories. It might be noted that the Food and Agriculture Organization estimates the minimum daily caloric requirement in tropical South Asia as 2,200 calories per person.

4. One of the reasons for the low supply of food is the very low crop yields in these countries. Indian farmers, for example, produce on the average 10 bushels of wheat per acre and 22 bushels of rice per acre. In Pakistan these yields are a little higher, being 14 and 28, respectively. Compare these yields with the average in the more developed countries: 26 bushels of wheat per acre and 69 bushels of rice—a difference of 2 to 1 in wheat and 3 to 1 in rice.

5. Pakistan and India are well aware of the urgent need for increased food production and have built up their development plans to achieve such increases. India, for example, expects to achieve an annual increase in cereals of over 7,000,000 tons within a period of 6 years. But this is a minimum goal and will only satisfy the increase in the population over the period without any increase in the presently abnormally low food intake.

6. The United States aid program is aimed at increasing food production in India and Pakistan above that planned by the countries and within the framework of their present programs but it must be realized that even the United States program is a minimum. Additional expenditures can produce greater quantities of food and permit a very small but very necessary increase in per capita food intake.

7. The United States program is designed to achieve increases in food production through a joint effort of the United States and the governments concerned. In India, for example, this will be done through the Indo-American technical cooperation fund, into which the United States and India deposit the dollars and the rupees which will be needed to go ahead with development projects mutually agreed upon. In the fiscal year ending June 1952, the United States will have deposited \$50,000,000 in the Indo-American fund while India will have contributed local currency equivalent to about \$88,000,000.

The United States program is based primarily on the organization and operation of community-development areas. In India, each of these projects will encompass about 300 villages each with a total area of about 500 square miles, cultivated area of about 150,000 acres and a population of about 200,000. Fifty-five of these projects are scheduled to be organized this fiscal year and will benefit directly about 11,000,000 people in India. The program for fiscal year 1953 includes an additional number of similar projects. It is hoped that over a 4-year period, 600 of these areas could be established all over India and thus benefit a third of the total population.

The community-development program is an integrated program bringing irrigation, fertilizer, modern agricultural extension techniques, public-health measures, production and distribution of better farm implements, and some basic education facilities into the project area. Working directly with the people, Indian and American technicians will have a unique opportunity to show the people convincingly that the democratic form of government is the best system for helping them solve their age-old problems. These projects will be based on the experience already gained in the Etawah region of India during the last 3 years. The Etawah project has conclusively demonstrated the effectiveness of the integrated approach in village development and has shown that with proper organization, adequate supplies and equipment, and normal cooperation from the villagers, a 46-50-percent increase in food production may be expected over a period of 4 years. No increase in agricultural production is expected in the first year

of a village-development project, although the effects of the production drive would begin to make themselves felt before the end of the first year and, of course, the psychological and spiritual effect would be enormous. In the second year of operation, a 10-percent rise in agricultural production can be expected; in the third year a 20-percent rise; and in the fourth year, when green manuring and extension techniques really take effect, a 50-percent rise can be anticipated.

8. India produces on the average about 46,000,000 tons of food grains per year. The needs of the Indian people are greater than domestic production, however, and India has to import over 3,000,000 tons of food grains annually in order to insure even the very low availability of 13.67 ounces per day per adult. This represents a drain on her foreign-exchange availabilities of about \$520,000,000 per year. India's 6-year plan calls for a continued import of 3,000,000 tons of food grains per year, plus an increase in domestic food production of 7,200,000 tons annually. This 1956 total food-grain availability of over 56,000,000 tons will permit an increase of food grains per adult—allowing for the increase in population—from 13.67 to 14.8 ounces per day, bringing it close to but still below the prewar figure of about 16 ounces per adult per day. The successful operation of 600 community development projects under Indo-American technical co-operation should add to the food-grain availabilities another four to five million tons per year, making it possible to attain prewar levels of adult consumption. It is pointed out that even the prewar average was one-third below the average consumption in the more developed areas of the world.

9. The cut in the India program resulting from the passage of the amendment would mean a disastrous reduction in the community development effort, and would greatly reduce the effectiveness of this program, important to both India and the rest of the free world.

The Congress has already drastically reduced the point 4 program for south and southeast Asia from the \$176,000,000 originally requested as a minimum by the administration to \$118,000,000. This reduction will in itself cripple the program; but to cut the program still further, as is done in this appropriation bill, threatens its complete emasculation. If our aims of peace and security in this vital area of the world are to be achieved, this sum must be restored by a further appropriation as early as possible.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, at the end of line 12, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the following proviso: "Provided further, That appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, may be used, any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, to start new construction projects directly and primarily related to thermonuclear matter."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in the regular independent offices appropriation bill there is a rider which states that the Atomic Energy Commission cannot start any new construction project for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year. By a long-standing precedent, this same rider applies to the supple-

mental appropriations bill. Therefore, the Commission cannot start any new project not set forth in the budget justification.

In general, and for the most part, I approve this provision. We have been in the atomic business long enough so that the Commission can plan ahead in its budget and in general principle I like the rider.

However, there is one new field where the technology is still new, still changing rapidly. In some respects it is unpredictable. I am referring to matters connected with the hydrogen bomb. I feel, and I suggest to the Senate that as regards these matters, and these matters only, that the rider be made inapplicable.

I have an amendment to the bill before us which would accomplish this purpose. I have in mind specific steps that might be taken under my amendment. These steps, I think, are of highest importance. They would not involve large sums of money relative to the appropriation as a whole. I am not at liberty to say anything more, but I do suggest that in this one area—in the area of the hydrogen program—for the sake of national defense, we should permit the Commission to start new construction projects which might not have been mentioned in the budget.

Members of the Appropriations Committee will remember that this subject was discussed at the time of the hearing with respect to the Atomic Energy Commission. It was my impression that it was the opinion of members of the Commission that this amendment was desirable. It was not in the bill as reported. It should be in the bill, for the sake of this program, which is a highly technical program. Much of the information which might be available is highly classified. I am confident that this amendment meets with the entire approval of the Joint Committee. There are one or two other members of the committee present. I believe they feel that this amendment is necessary. I think the Commission has been doing a grand job. The program is moving along; but in this one field, which has not yet developed entirely, a very technical and a very important field in our national defense, I suggest that the Senate ought to incorporate the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], to the committee amendment on page 17, line 12.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 17, to insert:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Trade Commission," \$125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator—Defense housing," on page 19, line 3, after the word "project," to strike out:

No part of this appropriation may be used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long as that agency proceeds with any public housing project after such project has been rejected or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing body has recognized local liability to reimburse the Federal Government for funds, if any, advanced on such project prior to such cancellations.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

No part of this appropriation may be used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long as that agency proceeds with any public-housing project after such project has been rejected or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing body has tendered the United States full reimbursement of Federal funds advanced on such project prior to such cancellation and a release from all obligations incurred under such project.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 8, to insert:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art," \$187,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 21, line 16, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$85,000,000" and insert "\$150,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 17, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That the limitation on travel expenses in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby increased from \$1,546,650 to \$1,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "War Claims Commission—Administrative expenses," on page 22, line 4, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading, on page 22, line 15, to change the chapter number from "VIII" to "IX."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Defense—Title I—Military public works," on page 22, after line 17, to insert:

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FOREIGN COUNTRIES
For establishment and development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries as authorized by the act of —, —, \$140,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 23, to strike out:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), and the act of —, 1952 (Public Law H. R. 8120, 82d Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger, motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$5,000,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said act of September 28, 1951; \$600,090,000; to remain available until expended. Of total amount appropriated in this paragraph, \$1,980,000 shall be allocated for Camp Crowder, Mo.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 16, to strike out:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PUBLIC WORKS

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), the act of September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783, 81st Cong.), the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), and the act of —, 1952 (Public Law —, H. R. 8120, 82d Cong.), seal coating for airfield pavements at Naval Station, Adak, Alaska; including not to exceed \$2,500,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said act of September 28, 1951; \$210,000 for the acquisition of facilities as authorized by said act of September 11, 1950; furniture for public quarters; personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engineering and architectural services as authorized by section 3 of the act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556); \$386,409,840, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 15, to strike out:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the act of March 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 17), the act of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 936), as amended, the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), and the act of —, 1952 (Public Law —, H. R. 8120, 82d Cong.), without regard to sections 1106 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; not to exceed \$52,620,000 for planning (including advance planning, master planning, and investigational engineering) as authorized by section 504 of said act of September 28, 1951; and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,200,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be expended for actual construction of facilities or struc-

tures at Grandview Air Terminal, Mo., until the city of Kansas City, Mo., has conveyed to the United States Government the fee simple title to all lands required for the base or has given the United States Government at least a 25-year lease to such land on a nominal rental basis.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 802. None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work where cost estimates exceed \$25,000 to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 803. None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be expended for additional costs involved in expediting construction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee for the purpose, shall establish a reasonable completion date for each project, taking into consideration the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal conditions affecting the construction and the application of economical construction practices.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 804. No part of the funds made available by this or any other act of the present Congress shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery, laundry, or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons therefor, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 19, to strike out:

SEC. 805. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to expand the facilities of the Department of the Air Force to establish or maintain a separate system for providing such supplies and services as were furnished to the Department of the Air Force by the Department of the Army prior to August 1, 1951.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 1, to change the section number from "806" to "802."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to the committee amendment on page 23, after line 16, relating to the Department of the Navy. Certain language was stricken out. I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment which, of course, would be stricken out along with the remainder of the section, but it would have the effect of putting this particular item in conference. Otherwise it would not be in conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment beginning on page 23, after line 16, was agreed to, is reconsidered.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, line 15, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike the period at the end of the line, insert a semicolon, and add the following language:

Naval Supply School, Athens, Ga., rehabilitation of existing facilities and new construction, \$2,030,000.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to say that the amendment is in line with the option to purchase from the University of Georgia. The property has been approved by the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses, and an authorization to purchase under the lease and purchase agreement has today been inserted in the bill. The exact number of the bill I do not recall.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Georgia that to add the suggested language to the language stricken out and then to strike it all out would not take the matter to conference. The suggestion is that the Senator offer the amendment as a separate paragraph to be inserted.

Mr. GEORGE. I offer the amendment as a separate subparagraph, following line 15 on page 24 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of the Army—Alaska Communication System—Construction," on page 27, line 21, after the word "contingencies", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 of the funds herein made available shall be available for painting the exterior of the Jesse Lee Children's Home at Seward, Alaska."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 28, to insert:

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army—Civil functions
Corps of Engineers
Rivers and harbors

Rivers and harbors: For an additional amount for "Rivers and harbors", including the objects specified under this head in the "Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953", \$5,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 9, to insert:

FLOOD CONTROL

Of the funds available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, not more than \$450,000 shall be available, until expended, for the planning, construction, and furnishing by the Corps of Engineers of adequate elementary and high-school facilities in the new combined municipality (commonly referred to as Newtown) in North Dakota, which is for the acquisition of and to replace the school facilities in the villages of Sanish and Van Hook, N. Dak., which are located within areas acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on said river, conditional upon Newtown School District No. 1, Mountrail County,

N. Dak., wherein such new combined municipality is located, contributing to the cost of such planning, construction, and furnishing the maximum amount of money which can be provided through a bond issue within the general debt limitation permitted by law for such school district.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 3, to change the chapter number from "IX" to "XI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Mutual Security—Title I—Department of Defense—Government and relief in occupied areas," on page 29, line 20, after the word "individuals", to insert "not to exceed 10 in number."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions," on page 44, line 9, after the word "herein", to insert "including not to exceed \$186,900 for salaries and expenses for operating a publicity office in the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 22, to strike out:

No part of any appropriation made by this chapter for any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal services in excess of an amount equal to 85 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for the payment of personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 15 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for personal services for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

(b) This section shall not apply to—

(1) not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

(2) positions filled from within the Mutual Security Agency and related Government functions provided for in this act;

(3) offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate:

Provided further, That subsection (1) of paragraph (b) shall operate to accomplish the provisions of paragraph (a), and the said 85 percent shall not be exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953; *And provided further*, That each agency shall impound and deposit in the general fund of the Treasury as soon as practicable, but not less frequently than quarterly, an amount equivalent to the savings resulting from the vacant positions which are prohibited from being filled by this section, based on the salaries of the prior incumbents of the positions.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said:

Mr. President, I have a statement in reference to some aspects of the supplemental appropriation bill which we have passed this evening. I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the RECORD, at the point where the appropriations for the Mutual Security portion of the supplemental appropriation bill were being discussed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

CERTAIN FACTS RELATING TO THE REDUCTIONS IN THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE POINT 4 PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1953 IN SOUTH AND SOUTHEASTERN ASIA

Certain hard facts regarding the situation and United States interests in South and Southeast Asia must be given great weight in considering whether the drastic House cut in appropriations available for our Point 4 program in the area should be allowed to stand. Most of these countries are newly-independent. The people of all these countries look to their present governments for economic progress. India serves as a prime example of the issues that face us and is a particularly appropriate example because the bulk of the proposed Point 4 program in the area is planned for India. In terms of appropriations, the House cut would strike at the heart of the Indian and Pakistan programs for fiscal year 1953. We must consider the following facts:

1. Political situation in India: India has a free and democratic government. Its constitution is modeled on our own. The people demand economic improvement from their present government. In the elections held the early part of this year, the Communist Party of India won 27 of 496 seats in the Central Parliament while getting 5 percent of the total vote. The Congress Party, now in power, still retains control of the Parliament and received 44 percent of the popular vote in the recent elections. The Communists were most successful in elections for the State assemblies of Madras, Travancore-Cochin, West Bengal and Hyderabad. In the Travancore Cochin State Assembly, the Communists got 32 seats to 44 for the Congress Party. The present Government of India and the entire free world was put on notice by the successes of the Communists in India who have greatly improved their position for propagandizing their program and for exploiting the people's hunger and poverty. Under the Indian constitution, elections must take place within the next 4½ years. There must be perceptible improvement in India before the next elections if the democratic government is to remain in power.

2. Need for economic progress: The great problem throughout the area is food and food production. The people of India average about 1,700 calories per person per day, and the people of Pakistan but slightly more. In both countries the average daily caloric intake is well below the estimated daily caloric requirement of 2,200 calories in tropical South Asia, and greatly in contrast with the average of 2,750 calories in the more developed regions of the world. A further index of low economic levels is the present per capita national income of about \$55 in India and Pakistan as compared with \$690 per person in more developed areas of the world and \$2,000 per person in the United States.

3. The country's own effort: The countries of South Asia have plans for the minimum essential economic development in their countries. The programs of both India and Pakistan represent a tremendous effort on the part of those countries and their peoples. India plans to spend on economic development nearly \$5,000,000,000 over a 6-year period and Pakistan plans to spend about \$800,000,000 in the same period. Plans of both countries are directed toward benefiting the people and put great emphasis on the problem of increased agricultural productivity. India plans to increase grain production by 7,200,000 tons by 1956-57. This would permit an increased availability of food grains per adult from 13.7 to 14.8 ounces per day, a figure still below the prewar figure of about 16 ounces per adult per day.

4. The point 4 program: The bulk of the point 4 program in India goes directly to the food problem through community de-

velopment. Each community would contain about 300 villages, with a population of about 200,000. Fifty-five of these community projects are being organized now in India. This type of community program not only gets to the heart of the food problem but, as explained in the presentation of the fiscal year 1953 program to the Congress, demonstrates the real interrelationship of material benefits and democracy through democratic organization. The curtailment of this very real and practical approach with United States aid in India would directly counter our aims in helping the free people of India and would run directly counter to our oft-expressed views on the importance of Asia.

5. Cut in the program: The program originally presented for point 4 in these areas was \$176,000,000. The authorizing legislation reduced this amount drastically to the level of \$118,000,000. A further cut as proposed would undercut and invalidate completely all previous expressions of intent in Asia. This is not in the interest of the United States. If a further cut is permitted, the program for India in fiscal year 1953 would be even less than that put forth in fiscal 1952.

6. Importance to the United States: The population of south Asia is approximately one-sixth of the world's population; 365,000,000 of these people live in India. South Asia is a key area in Asia and in the lands on the periphery of the area dominated by the Communists. Its importance to us in the struggle against Communist aggression is immeasurable. Its vital moral contribution to the free world is supplemented by its material contribution. Thirty-two percent of the United States manganese imports in 1951 came from India; 80 percent of our mica came from India, and 53 percent of our kyanite—to cite a few examples of United States material interest in south Asia.

The Communist Party in India is making great use of its newly achieved position in certain areas. It alleges lack of progress in the government of India's economic development program and ineffectiveness in the United States program of economic assistance. The Government of India is friendly to the United States and it is in our interests to aid them in their struggle for economic betterment. It is also in our interests to show real benefits to counter the claims of the Communist Party in India which is so firmly opposed by a government friendly to us. Our program for India in fiscal year 1953 cannot be cut further without harm to the interests of the United States now and in the near future before the next elections in India.

MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TITLE V, SEC. 10 (A), MUTUAL SECURITY ACT)

If I have ever seen a case of a man stooping to pick up a penny while his billfold of real money falls from his pocket unnoticed—it is this proposed cut of over 40 percent in the amount requested for our contribution to the United Nations technical assistance program and a similar program of the Organization of American States. The reduction from \$15,708,750 to \$9,171,333 is indefensible.

Here we are pouring out billions of dollars not only for our own necessary defense program and that of the free world, but billions of dollars to give that free world the economic strength it will need to carry its share of the defense program—all of this with the United States standing 100 percent of the cost—and we cut to the bone a small multilateral-assistance program where we get other countries to relieve us of all but 60 percent of the cost. If that is economy I do not know the meaning of the word.

To date, this Government has strongly supported the technical-assistance program of the United Nations. We contributed ap-

proximately \$12,000,000 to its first program year of 18 months ending December 31, 1951, and other governments went on the line for approximately \$8,000,000 in order that there could be a total program of a little over \$20,000,000. This calendar year, we are putting up \$11,400,000 and other countries are putting up approximately \$7,600,000 in order that there can be a total program, for the 12 months, of about \$19,000,000. For the calendar-year 1953 program, which will be supported by the voluntary pledges of governments during this next General Assembly, we have authorized a contribution of \$14,708,750. If that amount of money is available for our contribution to the United Nations program (reserving \$1,000,000 for the Organization of American States program) then other governments should be willing to put up approximately \$9,800,000, making it possible to have a total program of about \$24,500,000.

Now it makes sense to me for the United States to put up \$14,708,750 in order that there can be a total United Nations program of about \$24,000,000. This United Nations program is bringing the same sort of benefits to the underdeveloped countries which our own bilateral program is bringing to them. As a matter of fact, the United Nations program is able to operate more effectively under the political circumstances prevailing in certain countries than our own bilateral program. The two programs work hand in glove, in fact so much so that the Communists try to propagandize the underdeveloped countries against the United Nations program on the grounds that it is just a concealed United States program.

I hope the Senate will stop a minute and think about the significance of our having been able to get other countries, who usually only receive aid, to bear 40 percent of the cost of this program. Instead of trying to get them to take part of the 60 percent cost we are now bearing, our objective, if we are really economy-minded, should be to get them to join us in supporting an increasingly large United Nations program. If the amount of only \$9,171,333 is appropriated, and if \$1,000,000 is again contributed to the program of the organization of American States—and that is certainly not much for this program—only \$8,171,333 would remain for our contribution to the United Nations program, instead of the \$14,708,750. The result will not be that other countries make up the difference, so that there would still be a United Nations program of about \$24,000,000. The result would be that other countries would reduce their contributions in line with our reduction, so that their contributions would only total about \$5,000,000 and the total program would fall from its present level of about \$19,000,000 to about \$13,000,000. This would not only cut the heart out of the United Nations program, but it would mean that the pressures would be increased on our own bilateral program so that at some time and in some manner we would find ourselves putting up this difference through our own program of direct country assistance in which we would pay 100 percent of the cost.

I hope the Senate will vote the amount of \$15,708,750 out of urgent considerations of sensibility and economy.

MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TITLE V, SEC. 10 (A), MUTUAL SECURITY ACT)

It is essential that the full amount authorized, \$15,708,750, be appropriated for contribution to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the Technical Cooperation Program of the Organization of American States.

Legislative history

Authorization:	
Requested	\$17,000,000
Senate allowed	14,417,000
House allowed	17,000,000
Authorized	15,708,750
Appropriation:	
Requested	15,708,750
House committee recommended	15,708,750
Cut on House floor to	9,171,333

Situation

Of the \$15,708,750 authorized and requested for appropriation, it is planned that \$1,000,000 would be used as a contribution to the Technical Cooperation Program of the Organization of American States, which would permit the United States to pledge the same amount to the calendar 1953 program as it has pledged to the calendar 1951 and 1952 programs. (As the United States maintains its contribution at not more than 70 percent of total pledges, its actual contribution for 1951 is \$895,000 and for 1952 will be between this amount and \$1,000,000.)

The remaining \$14,708,750 is requested for the United States contribution to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. From our fiscal year 1951 funds, we have contributed \$12,007,500 to a total United Nations program of \$20,070,260 for the 18-month period beginning July 1, 1950 and ending December 31, 1951 (a United States contribution of 59.83 percent). From fiscal year 1952 funds, we are contributing \$11,400,000 (of \$12,000,000 appropriated) to a United Nations calendar year 1952 program of \$18,956,499 (a United States contribution of 60.14 percent as of the present date). Since the United Nations second program year is 12 months as compared with 18 months, the 1952 program of approximately \$19,000,000 represents a program increase of almost 50 percent.

A contribution of \$14,708,750, with the United States at approximately 60 percent, would support a total United Nations program of approximately \$24,514,000. This would represent a reasonable rate of increase for the United Nations program, although not as great as represented by the \$27,000,000 program which would have been possible if the amount requested to be authorized had been granted. Although modest in terms of our own bilateral program of technical assistance cooperation, the program of the United Nations and its specialized agencies is achieving concrete results in bringing technical aid to 55 countries with funds contributed by 63 countries. In addition the receiving countries themselves contribute locally to individual projects on the average an amount equal in value to the assistance received through the program.

For the United States, the United Nations program is an economical program. We are achieving the same things we attempt to achieve through our bilateral program with the other countries bearing 40 percent of the cost. The United Nations program represents an encouraging and significant step forward in inducing the governments of the free world, as a whole, to join together in rendering to each other the sort of assistance which otherwise would fail almost exclusively on United States resources. Further, it is possible through the United Nations program to achieve results which cannot always be achieved through our bilateral program due to the greater receptiveness of countries that must be strengthened to multilateral assistance under certain political circumstances.

The United Nations program is economical to the United States not only in terms of dol-

lars, but in terms of personnel. Of the 1,024 experts recruited by the United Nations program by the end of March 1952, only about 27 percent have come from the United States. We are thereby able to conserve expert manpower frequently in very short supply, as in the case of medical personnel and sanitary engineers. Under the United Nations program, it is possible for the under-developed countries themselves to make a very special contribution, in the way of staff, to other under-developed countries.

If the amount of \$15,708,750 is appropriated, the United States representatives to the United Nations General Assembly this fall will be able to demonstrate continued strong United States support for this multilateral program. If the amount of \$9,171,333 allowed by the House is appropriated, the offering of this amount, following upon much more substantial contributions for the 2 preceding years, will be understood to mean a withholding of full United States support and will be capitalized on by the Soviets, who are not participating in the program, as a demonstration that the United States is only interested in extending assistance where it can exercise direct control through the bilateral relationship.

House action

It is understood that the cut to \$9,171,333 on the floor was offered on the following fallacious thesis:

(a) It is United States policy to pay no more than one-third to United Nations programs.

(b) In calculating the total to which one-third applies, no account should be taken of the local contributions of countries receiving aid.

(c) One million dollars should be reserved for the OAS program. Since the Department contemplated a total United Nations program of \$24,514,000 (exclusive of local contributions), the amount of \$8,171,333 should be appropriated as representing one-third of that total.

Comment

The United States goal of one-third is relevant only to the United States contribution to the regular budgets of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Support for these budgets is compulsory on all members and the member contribution is a reflection of its status as a sovereign and equal member. It is to be assumed that all countries have a basic interest in the success of the regular program of the United Nations, and, therefore, the proportion of support should be leveled out. The special voluntary programs, like that of assistance to Palestine refugees (UNRWA) and technical assistance, are quite different and have been so recognized from the outset. Senator Vandenberg, in launching the United States drive toward a goal of one-third of the regular budget, made this quite clear as the United States delegation spokesman in the United Nations. The voluntary programs are supported by various countries in accordance with their own estimate of their interest and the ability to participate. The United Nations Technical Assistance Program is not supported by certain United Nations members, most significantly those of the Soviet bloc, and is supported by others who are not members, such as Switzerland and Cambodia. It has been very much to the credit of the United States that it has been prepared to support the United Nations program while being one of the few countries capable of carrying on such a program by itself alone. At the same time, it is recognized by all that 60-percent support on our part is most comparable to 100-percent support for technical assistance through

bilateral channels, and is not to be compared with our contribution to the regular budget of the United Nations which now stands at 36.90 percent and is in the process of reduction to 33 1/3 percent.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 6, to change the chapter number from "X" to "XII."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I inquire as to the last committee amendment that has been stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The last committee amendment stated was on page 46, line 6.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will an opportunity be given to offer amendments to the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not to the text of the bill at this time. Such amendments will be in order after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have an amendment which I should like to offer on page 44, beginning in line 14.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not in order at this time. It will be in order when the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Emergency agencies—Executive Office of the President—Office of Defense Mobilization," on page 46, line 21, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices—Defense Production Administration," on page 47, line 9, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert "\$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Small Defense Plants Administration—Salaries and expenses," on page 48, line 11, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$4,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Revolving funds," on page 48, line 15, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses, defense production activities," on page 49, line 18, after the word "services", to strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$32,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses, defense production activities," on page 50, line 4, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses, defense production activities," on page 50, line 22, after the word "ap-

propriation", to strike out "\$1,750,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Economic Stabilization Agency—Salaries and expenses," on page 51, line 12, after the numerals "1953", to strike out "\$57,130,000" and insert "\$75,000,000."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the committee amendment. We have just passed the Defense Production Act in which we have limited the authority of the price-stabilization agency. We have directed the Office of Price Stabilization to decontrol as rapidly as possible. We have provided that reports shall not be made by those who are selling under ceiling prices, and that includes the great majority of the business houses of the country at the present time.

By the committee amendment we would be increasing the amount allowed by the House, \$57,130,000, to \$75,000,000. There is more Government time wasted by the employees of OPS than by any other department or agency of the Government. Not only do they waste their own time but they waste the time of businessmen by interfering with the regular conduct of their business in prowling around their books and requiring them to file unneeded reports, which are never looked at but merely filed for future reference and possible future political advantage. There is no need to increase the amount of money, when the Congress has ordered them to decontrol in certain fields and has almost completely nullified requirements for the making of reports and returns.

They have a payroll now of \$2,500,000 in my State of Ohio. I say very frankly that I believe if every one of the employees of OPS were to go into some honest and constructive type of work their contribution to the economy of the country would be far greater than what is gained from the many orders, releases, decrees, and manifestos which they issue. Many of them come out so fast that it is impossible to read all of them. Certainly it is impossible to catalog all of them. No one can understand them. They have been written by men who were clearly educated beyond their intelligence. They have had no experience in business. Their work is an interference with and an encumbrance upon the legitimate business of the country. I can see no excuse for giving them \$57,000,000, much less for increasing the amount to \$75,000,000.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Ohio in seriously questioning the advisability of increasing the appropriation. By that I do not mean to infer that the members of the Committee on Appropriations have not had all of the facts and circumstances presented to them. I recall well the session last night, and I see on the floor the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, for whom I have great affection, that the amount recommended is a reduction

from \$112,000,000, which was requested. Last night in the meeting of the Appropriations Committee it was decided by a very substantial majority vote to recommend \$75,000,000. We all know that it is a compromise. I know the law as well as my distinguished friend from Kansas and my distinguished friend from Ohio, whose amendment with reference to the Atomic Energy Commission I just supported. This is liquidation language, and the amount must be provided if we are to carry out the law we have passed.

Last night during the long session of the committee meeting, it was felt that we should recommend \$75,000,000 and let the matter go to conference. I know that the law does not require the filing of reports by businessmen who sell below ceiling prices.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the committee well recalls that during the months when we held hearings, we repeatedly heard representatives of the agency involved say that they could make cuts here and make cuts there. Perhaps this figure represents a cut. If it is, I fail to see it. In all sense of propriety and fairness, we cannot permit such a large increase, particularly when the agency is leveling off and when many reports are dispensed with. Certainly that situation should be reflected in the amount of money we appropriate to the agency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say that I am sorry the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana is not in the Chamber, because he voted against the control law. Nevertheless, in committee those who had voted against the control law thought that, since the law had been passed, in justice to the agency, whose appropriation had been reduced from \$112,000,000, the committee should recommend the amount stated in the amendment.

I come from a State, as does the Senator from Kansas, where we are not concerned with controls. I was thinking about the large communities for which the law was passed primarily.

The Defense Production Act was passed, and the House appropriated money to carry out the law that was passed, and the House report will show that the Representatives who voted against the amendment made the motion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true, also, that at the time when the House passed this bill and voted for \$57,130,000 for this item, the House had just passed a bill which practically emasculated the controls?

In other words, the action the House took in connection with this item of this bill was in keeping with the action taken by the House in passing the other bill; and after this amount was voted by the House of Representatives, the other bill went to conference, and the conferees worked out a measure which eliminated

much of the emasculation provided for by that bill as it had been passed by the House. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding.

Mr. HILL. In other words, today the situation, insofar as the House, the Senate, and the country as a whole are concerned, is entirely different from the situation which existed at the time when the House voted for the amount of \$57,130,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding. The Senator from Tennessee will recall—if I am in error, I hope I may be corrected—that those who voted against this item, as adopted by the House, suggested that since the other bill had been passed, the amount of \$75,000,000 should be provided in this item, as opposed to the amount of \$57,000,000, which had been voted by the House of Representatives. The larger amount was suggested in this case. After the larger amount is voted, this matter will go to conference.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is not now on the floor, but at any rate I believe I am correct when I state that he said he voted against the controls, but that since Congress had taken action in favor of such controls, the bill should provide sufficient appropriations for them.

Mr. MAYBANK. After all, there are 155,000,000 people in the United States, and there is much to be done for them. That is all I have to say.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe that a study of the figures involved in this matter will show that the President's budget estimate was \$53,200,000. The House figure was \$57,130,000.

The employment as of June 30, 1952, was 17,049.

The amount of employment as estimated under the President's budget was 15,762.

The number supportable under the provisions voted by the House of Representatives was 7,753.

The agency's request of the Senate Appropriations Committee was for \$93,069,000, which would furnish employment for 15,137 persons, or somewhat more than 600 less than the number who would be provided employment under the President's original budget estimate.

I felt this was a larger increase than should be granted.

However, as has been said here on the floor, the matter is going to conference.

I quite agree with the Senator from Ohio that the agency itself should be prepared to reduce its force far more rapidly than apparently it was planning to do.

But I believe that when this matter goes to conference and when a compromise is reached between the amount voted by the Senate and the amount voted by the House of Representatives, this agency will of necessity have to reduce its force a little more rapidly than it is doing now.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from California.

Mr. President, a moment ago I said the figure was \$112,000,000. At that time I did not have the figures before me. The correct figure is \$102,000,000.

I voted for this amount only for the reason that this item is to go to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, in line 12. (Putting the question.)

The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. BRICKER and other Senators asked for a division.

On a division, the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 51, in line 18, after the word "requires", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That subparagraph (B) of section 204 (f) (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(B) In any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, village, or unincorporated area; and"

(2) of section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which makes the declaration specified in paragraph (1) (b) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee the meaning of this provision. It is legislation in an appropriation bill, and it is an amendment to the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall be only too glad to give an explanation.

I shall charge the fault to the Banking and Currency Committee, because the distinguished Senator from Ohio was in the conference; and when we wrote the rent act and when we agreed in conference to the September 30 date, it was understood by me, as chairman, that in towns which were unincorporated, such as Oak Ridge, Tenn., about which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee had asked me, and in towns about which both the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] had asked me, we should provide the same opportunity for those towns to de-control themselves by public vote as we provided in the case of incorporated towns.

Mr. BRICKER. I understand that there is to be no change in the law itself.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is to be no change at all in the law itself. This committee amendment is submitted simply in order to include provision for the unincorporated towns, such as Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Mr. BRICKER. Very well, Mr. President; I am satisfied.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, beginning in line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Services Administration," on page 52, line 17, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$8,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Civil Defense Administration—Operations," on page 53, line 15, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 is for warehousing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal contributions," on page 53, line 21, after the word "funds", to strike out "\$29,500,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, after line 21, to insert:

EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

For procurement of reserve stocks of emergency civil defense materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, \$50,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 6, to change the chapter number from "XI" to "XIII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Claims, audited claims, and judgments," on page 54, line 14, after the word "Senate", to strike out "Document Numbered 144" and insert "Documents Numbered 154 and 157"; and in line 16, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$6,489,954" and insert "\$1,121,563."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 5, to change the chapter number from "XII" to "XIV."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions—Departments, agencies, and corporations," on page 55, line 7, to change the section number from "1201" to "1401"; in line 12, after the word "at", to strike out "1,400" and insert "1,600", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "notwithstanding the provisions of section 405 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 15, to change the section number from "1202" to "1402."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 18, to change the section number from "1203" to "1403."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 8, to change the section number from "1204" to "1404."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, from what page of the bill is the clerk reading the committee amendments?

The VICE PRESIDENT. From page 57, in line 8, where the committee amendment calls for the change of a section number.

Mr. THYE. Have we passed beyond the committee amendment on page 54?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. COOPER was talking to me about a letter which came from the Comptroller General, a letter relating to the amendment on page 54. I am very sorry that I was not aware that that amendment had been reached.

Therefore, Mr. President, I must ask that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 54, in line 16, was agreed to, be reconsidered. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not believe the committee amendment on page 54, in line 16, should be agreed to, for it is my understanding that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], has received a letter from the Office of the Comptroller General, and has also received a letter from the Department of Justice—has he not—relating to the question that is involved in this amendment.

I have before me a copy of the letter from the Office of the Comptroller General.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not understand the statement the Senator from Minnesota made.

Mr. THYE. I have said that I have before me a copy of a letter from the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States. The letter is addressed to the Honorable KENNETH McKELLAR, chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The letter relates to the item which is involved in the committee amendment on page 54, in line 16.

As I understand, the communications which have been received on this question would completely clarify the question, and I understand that the committee amendment should be rejected, and that the full amount of the item voted by the House of Representatives, namely, \$6,489,954, is the amount which should be appropriated in order completely to settle these claims.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have the letter before me; it has just been handed to me at this time. It is dated July 3.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. The letter is from Mr. Yates, the acting Comptroller General.

Very frankly, I have not read the letter. If the Senator from Minnesota will read the letter, I shall be obliged to him.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may the letter be read at the desk by the clerk?

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read by the clerk.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield to me, let me say that I think the Senator who last night raised some question in the committee about this matter, is now in the restaurant getting dinner. I have asked that he be sent for. In the event the letter is to be read before he returns to the Chamber, I would ask that this amendment be temporarily passed over, until he can return to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 54, line 16, will be temporarily passed over.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 57, in line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 13, to change the section number from "1205" to "1405."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 22, to change the section number from "1206" to "1406."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, in line 13, to change the section number from "1207" to "1407."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 20, to change the section number from "1208" to "1408."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 3, to change the section number from "1209" to "1409."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 14, to change the section number from "1210" to "1410."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 20, to strike out:

Sec. 1211. During the current fiscal year, personnel and appropriations or funds available for salaries and expenses to any department, agency, or corporation in the executive branch of the Government, shall be transferred to any defense activity under the jurisdiction of such department or agency in such numbers or amounts as may be necessary for the discharge of responsibilities relating to the national defense assigned to such department, agency, or corporation by or pursuant to law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 6, to change the section number from "1212" to "1411."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 11, to change the section number from "1213" to "1412."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 4, to change the section number from "1214" to "1413."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 16, to change the section number from "1215" to "1414."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 1, to change the section number from "1216" to "1415."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments, except for those which have been passed over, the first of which is on page 5. That amendment will be stated at this time.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Committee on Appropriations Resolution Numbered 11, adopted by the committee on July 2, 1952, \$500,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas wish to recur now to that committee amendment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, Mr. President. I am opposed to the amendment, for reasons which I have heretofore stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, after line 9, which was discussed at some length earlier in the evening.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, can the Senator from Arkansas advise the Senate whether there has been a vote in the House of Representatives on the question involved in this committee amendment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I could not be accurate about it, but so far as I know there has not been.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the matter still under discussion in the House?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The matter is still under discussion. I may say to the Senator that I was advised that a filibuster was actually in process in the House to try to prevent the bill from coming up, until we took this action awhile ago, and that, when they received word of that, they took up the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why would it not be satisfactory to the Senator to attach his bill, S. 913, to an amendment to the committee amendment and put them both in the bill, leaving it to the conference to work out the matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That would be entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be perfectly willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, Mr. President, I offer for myself, and on behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], as an amendment, Senate bill 913, which was passed by the Senate on April 8.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would not be in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit it would be in order unless objected to, or unless a point of order were made against it. In the absence of a point of order, I ask that the amendment

be accepted. The chairman says he is willing to accept it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be perfectly willing to take it to conference. I think it should be taken to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would amend the appropriation item; would it not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, it would amend this particular provision for a particular purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have the entire amendment read?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No, Senators are familiar with it. I suggest that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, offered by Mr. McCLELLAN for himself and on behalf of Mr. MOODY and Mr. FERGUSON, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 5, after line 14, insert the following:

"That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the "joint committee") and to be composed of 18 members as follows:

"(1) Five Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, three from the majority party and two from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Five Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, three from the majority party and two from the minority party to be chosen by such committee; and

"(3) Four Members who are members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate, two from the majority party and two from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(4) Four Members who are members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives, two from the majority party and two from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than 2 weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives, the members of

such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however,* That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) A majority of the Members of each House who are members of the joint committee shall together constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a lesser number, as determined by the joint committee, may constitute a subcommittee and be authorized to conduct hearings and make investigations. Any member of a subcommittee so designated shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of any hearing or investigation, but the concurrence of a majority of the members of such subcommittee shall be necessary before any report or findings may be submitted to the joint committee.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider essential programs, and to consider changing economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in Government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint

committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

"(4) to report to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year under way, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) The joint committee shall, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, employ and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee, and all such employees shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties to which they may be assigned: *Provided, however,* That the services of any such employee may be terminated by the concurrence of 11 members of the joint committee. No person shall be employed by the joint committee until it has favorably considered the data submitted after a thorough investigation as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"(h) The joint committee shall, upon request, assign members of its staff (1) to assist the staff of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending in the House of Representatives, and (2) to assist the staff of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending in the Senate. At other times the staff of the joint committee shall serve the joint committee directly.

"(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, reports, and estimates of budget requirements of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia.

"(j) It shall be the duty of each agency of the Government to supply to the joint committee any copies of any budgetary request submitted to the Bureau of the Budget which the joint committee or any subcommittee thereof may request, either for regular or supplemental appropriations required for each fiscal year, with the detailed justifications in support thereof.

"(k) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request

of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"(1) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such terms includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(m) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

SEC. 2. Effective at the beginning of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress, section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Appropriations Committees of both Houses shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semiannually shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information of the Congress."

SEC. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional committee hearings, and shall not affect the independence of committee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a committee amendment which has not yet been disposed of, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 54, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "\$6,489,954" and insert "\$1,121,563."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not believe that that amendment should prevail. There is at the clerk's desk a letter which was received from the Comptroller General relative to the question of why the committee proposed this particular amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the letter may be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter has already been ordered read, but the reading of it was withheld on account of the absence of the Senator from Oregon. The clerk will read the letter.

The legislative clerk read the letter, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 3, 1952.

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate greatly the time and attention given our representatives to explain yesterday before your Committee the background of the item in the current Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, to pay awards of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission as detailed in the Comptroller General's letter of June 30 to you.

Today we have had opportunity to review a copy of a letter of the Honorable Holmes Baldrige, Assistant Attorney General, addressed to you, which is very helpful in setting forth the steps taken by the Department in the settlement of the litigation before the Commission. The letter refers to the test case among this group of motor carriers, R-B Freight Lines, Inc., which was settled by the Commission on an extremely high rental rate figure for the trucks and other equipment. You will recall it was mentioned in our letter that on one of the cases court review had been sought. The Assistant Attorney General's letter explains that after the Supreme Court refused to grant a hearing on that case, the Department of Justice succeeded in negotiating a settlement in the remaining cases which obviously is considerably beneficial to the Government when compared with the Commission's award in the R-B case.

If, as I understand, the Attorney General in his experience was fully satisfied that none of the other cases would have succeeded in reaching the Supreme Court, I do not wish to leave the impression that the subsequent steps taken by the Department were necessarily criticizable. Confronted with a situation of a precedent award which became final on the Supreme Court's refusal to consider it, the Department may have felt itself required to reach the best bargain it could on the remaining group of about 100 carriers.

The fact remains that the Commission awarded damages upon the rental theory and even that, not upon the basis of the rental of a going business concern, but upon the separate rental of each item of equipment. I do not understand the Department's letter to agree that this theory is correct in law, nor have I yet been advised of a prior court decision supporting that theory in the

special class of "taking" cases represented by these labor dispute seizures.

In summary, I believe the General Accounting Office was fully justified in the recommendation made to you yesterday at the hearing to the effect that the present payment of these claims be deferred until there is opportunity for further consideration of the merits of the rule of damages allowed, either by your committee, the Judiciary Committee, or by other appropriate tribunal, but it must not be overlooked, as explained to the committee yesterday, that interest continues to accrue on the claims until finally paid.

However, if the committee are of the opinion that the Congress, having established the Commission to decide these cases and having provided for the payment of their awards after the manner of Court of Claims judgments is legally required to recognize the settlements made after the Supreme Court refused certiorari in the test case, there would seem to be appropriate the inclusion of a notation in the committee's report to the effect that the payments are being made upon the basis of an award which is now res adjudicata, and are not to be regarded as evidence of concurrence by the Congress in the measure of damages followed.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK L. YATES,
Acting Comptroller General of the
United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not reject the committee amendment and accept \$6,489,954 provided by the House.

On a number of claims in the Motor Carrier Seizure case, there was evidence before the committee yesterday indicating that the Comptroller General had reason to believe that the amount of damages awarded to the various carriers was excessive.

Mr. President, in regard to certain cases it was shown that, within a period of 15 months, while the seizure continued, possession was not taken, but there was merely a token seizure. The amount of payment decided to be made to the carrier within the period of 15 months was greater than the entire amount of the assets of the company. I talked with one of those who had charge of this investigation at the Comptroller General's Office.

I am of the opinion that we should not at this time decide to pay these claims, that the time for appeal under the statute creating this commission has not expired, and will not expire for a period of 30 days; that, if we pay these claims, that will end all the litigation, it will take away the right of appeal. I am of the opinion that we should have an investigation by the Judiciary Committee as to what took place in the allowance of these claims, and in connection with the measure of damages.

I hope, Mr. President, the Senate will sustain the committee in this matter and not take it out of the hands of the Congress or of the Attorney General by paying the claims and appropriating money for the purpose of paying these claims. Therefore, I ask the Senate to vote favorably on the committee amendment striking out the House figure and including, instead, the figure proposed by the Senate. Then we will have, at least, an opportunity to discuss it with the House. If we do not adopt the committee amend-

ment, we shall have no discussion with the House. We will have to take their figures and the matter will not be in the conference.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the reason why I called to the attention of the Senate this committee amendment is because, from all the information and evidence which I have been privileged to study, this is a just and proper claim. The Government owes the money and it will pay interest on it if the claim is not allowed.

I invited attention to it for the sole purpose of having this discussion on the Senate floor, in order to support the conferees when they give further study to the question.

The letters received from the Department of Justice and the Comptroller General, while, in my opinion they have been of assistance, have not furnished all the information we should have. We have found that the Comptroller General's investigators did not know any facts about this case and that they contradicted themselves in the statement they made in their letter to us.

Mr. President, I do not expect to be a member of the conference committee myself, because I am a junior member of the Appropriations Committee, but I do say to the Members of the Senate who will serve as conferees that this is a legitimate claim, in my opinion. I know the companies which are involved. They are truck companies in Minnesota. I was Governor of Minnesota when their property was confiscated by the Government, and put under Government supervision. The Government will have to pay a large amount of interest if the claim is not settled.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am in agreement with the position taken by the Senator from Minnesota on this question. I hope the Senate will concur in the recommendation of the committee to strike out the disputed figures and permit the matter to go to conference, so that the Senate conferees will have advantage of the information contained in a letter from the Assistant Attorney General which none of us, as I understand, has yet seen.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it came to my office, I have not been able to find it.

Mr. CORDON. No member of the committee has had an opportunity to look at the information contained in that letter, nor have we had an opportunity to study either the law or the record of the case, all of which must be gone into when it reaches the conference.

I want to assure the Senator from Minnesota, as one member of the conference, that I am certain the conference will go into the matter thoroughly and attempt to do justice.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the evening, when I was detained from the Senate, action was taken upon an amendment on page 54, in lines 14 and 15. In other words, the committee amendment was adopted rejecting a recommended appropriation of several million dollars for

claims which had been adjudicated by the Motor Carriers Claims Commission in favor of certain motor carriers whose lines had been taken over by the Government during the war.

Because of my absence there was not read into the RECORD at that time a letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Holmes Baldridge. I have no desire to reopen the matter, but I feel that the conferees ought to have before them the complete report.

I should say that when the Comptroller General appeared, through his representatives, before the committee with respect to this item for which there was a budget estimate, I called the Bureau of the Budget to find how the estimate had been reached, and learned that it had been regarded as based on adjudicated claims.

I then talked with the Department of Justice and received from that Department a letter which, in brief, shows that the Department had opposed the original law setting up the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, and that it had recommended a veto of the law. It had opposed the claims, and when one of the judgments was reached, the Department of Justice took an appeal to the Supreme Court, which declined to issue a writ. That became the final judgment, and thereafter the Department of Justice negotiated settlements with the claimants which were one-third below the amount for which the original decisions had been reached.

The RECORD seems to indicate that this is a res adjudicata matter, and the important fact is that interest is accumulating at the rate of 4 percent a year on these claims, amounting to approximately \$300,000.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Department of Justice, together with the remarks I have just made, may be printed in the body of the RECORD in the proper place in connection with the discussion of the amendment on page 54, lines 14 and 15, so that the RECORD in connection with the subject may be in one spot.

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, this matter was called to my attention today and I was advised of the facts which are substantially as the Senator has stated them. The interest amounts to \$700 a day.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the fact.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 3, 1952.

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This letter is written in response to a request from Senator O'MAHONEY's office in reference to the disposition of certain claims pending before the Motor Carrier Claims Commission. I am advised that the Senate is presently considering a request to pay awards made by the Commission on some of these claims. The following is a brief history of these claims.

On August 11, 1944, the President issued Executive Order No. 9462, authorizing the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation to seize and operate 103 Midwest motor carrier transportation systems in order to

avoid the crippling effects of a strike. The carriers had refused to grant certain wage increases recommended by the War Labor Board. The seizure was statutory. The Executive Order recited that the action was taken under the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645), the First War Powers Act, and section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 859), as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act (57 Stat. 163).

These carriers were federally operated from August 1, 1944 to November 1, 1945.

By act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222), the Congress created the Motor Carrier Claims Commission to hear and determine the carriers' claims for just compensation arising from Government seizure and operation. The act restricted review of the Commission's determinations to certiorari to the Supreme Court.

The Department of Justice recommended against passage of this bill and testified against it. After passage the Department recommended veto of the bill.

The carriers filed claims with the Commission, which, with interest, totalled approximately \$50,000,000.

The first case decided by the Commission involved the R-B Freight Lines, Inc. This case was selected as the test case since it involved a period when there was a technical taking only as well as a period when the Government took over the exclusive management and operation of the line. It was the unanimous decision of the Commission that there had been a taking under the fifth amendment for the entire period of the seizure for which the carrier was entitled to just compensation. The Commission fixed the amount of just compensation upon a rental theory which provided for payment of 7 cents per mile for over-the-road equipment, \$1.11 per hour for pick-up trucks, and 10 percent per month of the value of office property and equipment.

Based upon the award in this case the total recovery of all the carriers, including interest, would have approximated \$25,000,000. At this point petitioners for 91 of the carriers approached the Department of Justice for a settlement. The Department refused, first, because we hoped to defeat liability on Supreme Court review and second, failing that we hoped such review would result in a formula which would reduce substantially the amount of recovery. Accordingly, the Department filed a petition for certiorari in the Supreme Court. The R-B Freight Lines, Inc., joined in this petition. The petition was denied on February 4, 1952 (342 U. S. 933).

Subsequently, 15 additional cases were decided by the Commission. A majority of the Commission awarded damages in these cases on a reduced rental formula which would result in recovery by the 91 carriers, with interest, of approximately \$14,500,000. One Commissioner dissented. A majority of the Commission informed the Government that it saw no reason why it should depart from the rental formula adopted in these 15 cases, in deciding the remaining cases.

The 91 claimants, including the 15 whose claims had been decided, again approached the Government for a settlement, if they could secure prompt disposition.

After a series of negotiations the 91 claimants agreed to settle for 33⅓ percent less than the formula adopted by the Commission in the 15 cases mentioned above. Under this formula the ceiling on compensation, including interest, was not to exceed \$8,800,000.

After completion of the audits this figure including interest, was reduced to approximately \$7,500,000. Since this was \$7,000,000 less than the over-all cost would have been had all the claims been formally processed through the Commission, the settlement was in the best interests of the Government and

hence the Department agreed to such disposition of the claims.

Under its enabling act the Commission is required to certify to Congress each claim adjudicated or disposed of.

In summary, the Commission was established by the Congress to hear and adjudicate these claims. The Department of Justice opposed the passage of such legislation and recommended its veto after passage. The Supreme Court refused to review the test case on which the Department took an appeal. The offer in compromise saved the Government \$7,000,000 that it would otherwise have had to pay under the formula consistently followed by the Commission, a formula which the Commission stated it saw no reason to depart from in disposing of the remaining claims on its docket.

Interest is accumulating at the rate of 4 percent per year on these claims. On the basis of settlement for \$7,500,000, this amounts to \$300,000 per year.

It is requested that this letter be made a part of the record in the Senate's consideration of Senate Document No. 144.

I will be glad to supply any additional details if you need them.

Sincerely yours,

HOLMES BALDRIDGE,
Assistant Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 44, before the period in line 22, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "but nothing in this proviso shall be construed to prevent the operation of export payment programs pursuant to section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, 74th Cong.), as amended, or to prevent the sale at less than the support price, including handling and storage costs, of any commodity from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks which has substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida explain what he thinks this amendment will accomplish?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to do so.

The bill contains a very worthy amendment placed in the House bill by Representative WHITTEN, of Mississippi. The purpose of his amendment was to prevent the use of section 32 funds in such a way as to allow the friendly governments operating under the Mutual Security Program to buy agricultural products from the Commodity Credit Corporation at less than the support price and then have the difference made up with section 32 funds.

I am thoroughly in accord with the purpose and the objective of the amendment. Unfortunately, the Whitten amendment goes further than that, and would operate to ban entirely the use of section 32 funds in the very field where they are most needed and for which they are preferred, under existing law, in the giving of help to agricultural products that do not have sup-

port prices, in the field of perishables, particularly fruit, raisins, prunes, and products of that kind.

There are under way several export programs in which this is the theory: Private businesses are allowed to sell to foreign purchasers at what they can get in order to try to recreate foreign markets that were wiped out during World War II. Up to a certain point, out of section 32 funds, the Department of Agriculture will supplement the total price so as to bring it to the prevailing price here.

This year, up to the end of May, there had been a total of \$13,400,000 so used: For citrus fruit, about \$4,000,000; apples and pears, \$2,500,000; prunes and raisins, \$6,000,000; honey, \$1,000,000.

The prices of none of those items are supported, except honey. The honey did not go through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In fact, none of these items have gone through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Department of Agriculture under legislation which we passed is trying to get rid of the surplus production so it will not break down domestic prices.

Mr. CORDON. This language would carry out the main purpose desired in section 32?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. Likewise, the purposes which I believe are the principal purposes of Representative WHITTEN are preserved, and it is particularly provided that the use of section 32 funds in connection with fruits and dried prunes and raisins, and the like, shall not be disturbed.

There is one other factor. When I took up the matter with the Department of Agriculture, my attention was called to the fact that they have been active in the disposal of damaged goods which had been acquired in the support-price program, which now they are handling, under existing law, by selling at a discount, in large measure to foreign nations, as they have recently sold out the large supply of powdered eggs. They have recently sold the last of them. So, my amendment provides that the Whitten amendment will be further amended, so as to make it continue to allow of the disposition of deteriorated goods acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the regular support-price program.

So my amendment covers those proposed two changes only, in the amendment of the able Representative from Mississippi.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the amendment of the Senator from Florida is necessary and desirable. As the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, it is basically in line with the section 32 funds, and is for the purpose of helping recreate the historic markets in those perishable crops which American agriculture has produced.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I, too, have that belief, or I would not have offered the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may return to the amendment on page 5, lines 10 through 14, so that I may ask for reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to, and that it may be rejected and go out of the bill, so that it will not be in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the request of the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move that the committee amendment on which I have asked for reconsideration be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has previously been agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask for reconsideration of the action of the Senate in agreeing to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas asks to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 5, lines 10 to 14, was agreed to. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no intention of objecting, but I should like to know the basis upon which the reconsideration of the amendment has been asked.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say, as the Senator probably knows, that I objected to the amendment earlier today, and it was passed over. Then I moved to include an amendment in the bill, and the motion was agreed to. Immediately the committee amendment was agreed to, but I did not hear the action by which it was agreed to.

I can show the Senate the device employed in the House, actually, to prevent the so-called McClellan bill from coming up, by a vote of 173 to 155. I can show the Senate how that happened. I wish to indicate to the Senate the purpose of the House resolution proposing an appropriation of \$500,000. What they proposed to do, among other things, was to allow the ranking minority member of each subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, with the approval of the chairman of the committee, to appoint an employee at a basic salary of \$2,400 a year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has sufficiently explained the matter to me. I certainly have no objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that is the way the House is going to operate, I want to remove the Senate amendment out of the bill, and I ask that it be rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is only one thing that disturbs me in connection with deleting the amendment from the bill. We received a letter from the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations asking that the provision be included in the bill. So far as the Senate is concerned, it has been customary, as a matter of comity in dealings between the two Houses, that when the House makes a request relating to its own business, it is granted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Last night I was quite swayed by the discussion of comity. When an item has been placed in a bill by the action of the House, I certainly would be very loath, with respect to an amendment dealing with the business of the House, to strike it out or not to accept it in the Senate. I believe the House would take the same attitude in connection with an item included in the bill by a vote of the Senate.

However, I think it is on a little different basis when, instead of coming by action of the other body, the proposal comes in the form of a letter from a committee, albeit we have the highest regard and respect for the committee. I would not want to see established a precedent whereby a letter from a committee asking for something to be done was considered on exactly the same plane as action taken by the other body as a coequal branch of Congress. I think there is a distinction between the two from the aspect of comity.

Mr. HAYDEN. As far back as I can remember, whenever the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations has asked the Senate to place in a bill an item that related solely to the House, we have never hesitated to do it. For that reason I am hesitant about voting to strike this amendment. I want it to stay in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If this amendment is not rejected, I shall offer an amendment to provide \$500,000 for the Senate. We shall have to protect ourselves one way or another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, lines 10 through 14.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of H. R. 6758 (as amended and passed by the Senate and House of Representatives) authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, \$125,000.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, recently, at the time of the last regular call of the calendar, the Senate passed unanimously a bill authorizing a program of research in the utilization of saline waters. The bill had come over from the House. The Senate eliminated from the bill the portion which would have allowed the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a demonstration plant himself. The amendment of the Senate was agreed to by the House, and the bill is now at the White House awaiting the signature of the President.

The Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Interior considered the matter important enough to send to the Senate a special communication on July

1, asking for \$400,000 with which to initiate the program. In the hurry of its work last night, the committee did not see fit to include the item in the bill.

I have been conferring with representatives of the Department of the Interior, and they agree that they could initiate the program for \$125,000. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in sending the estimate for \$400,000, spoke of the need as being urgent, because of the acute shortage of water in many areas of the Nation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I consider this a very important item. Many cities along the coast are becoming short of water. If a cheap method can be devised to take salt out of water, a great deal of development can be brought about throughout the United States.

Mr. CASE. And it will save a great deal of money.

Mr. McFARLAND. It will not apply to the State of Arizona, but it will apply to other States. At the rate at which our population is increasing, certainly we should not hesitate to appropriate a mere \$125,000, which may mean so much to the people of future generations.

I certainly hope the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be agreed to. I believe it may mean a great deal if a cheap enough method can be found. I understand that those seeking such a method have success almost within their grasp, so we should not hesitate to try to give science this assistance.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the contribution that has been made in behalf of the amendment by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Has the bill in question been enacted?

Mr. CASE. It has passed both the House and Senate. It is now at the White House. It has not yet been signed. So I made the language of the amendment correspond to the bill as amended and passed by the Senate and House. I am advised that, as of yesterday afternoon, a favorable report had been prepared for the President. Whether or not the bill was signed today, I do not know.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. I think it will be in opposition to the Senator's position, but it will not take long.

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CORDON. I feel that we must ultimately implement this legislation. I was one of those who considered the question in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe this is a chore which ought to be handled. It is a very grave question in my mind, however, whether or not the Government can make arrangements for the work to be done by private enterprise without setting up a completely new operation of its own. The Government does not know whether it can do so or not. It has not

yet set up a program. It seems to me that rather than put the money in this bill, we ought to put it in a regular bill after both the Interior Department and the Congress have had an opportunity to consider just how to approach the problem.

Mr. CASE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator—and what I wish to say is directly on the point he raises—that when the bill came before the Senate we struck out the section which would have permitted the Government to set up a demonstration plant; and there was colloquy between the Senator from Illinois and myself on that particular point. I pointed out that the amendment which I offered struck out that authority.

In addition, when the bill went over to the House for concurrence in the Senate amendment, Representative ENGLE, of California, had a letter from the Secretary of the Interior. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a day or two ago. If it is important I will look it up, but I am sure that the Senator will take my word for it.

Mr. CORDON. Certainly.

Mr. CASE. In that letter the Secretary of the Interior stated positively and directly that not only did he not contemplate the establishment of a Government plant, but that he thought he was forbidden to do so by the history of the legislation. This amendment provides only for making arrangements with private concerns or universities to conduct the research under research contracts.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Has the Senator any information as to what the Interior Department has done in the way of investigating the present situation with reference to exploration in this field, to determine whether there are in progress any exploratory operations either in universities or laboratories, or in private enterprise or elsewhere, so that we may be in a position intelligently to spend \$125,000?

Mr. CASE. I may say to the Senator that the budget estimate, which the Secretary asked for, and which the budget approved, called for \$400,000.

Mr. CORDON. I understand that. On the face of it, that indicates to me that they do not know what they are doing.

Mr. CASE. That is only a part of the answer. The second answer—and I can say this as a positive fact—is that there is a nonprofit foundation known as Ionics Research, Inc., set up at Boston, which one of the men from my staff visited. It is a foundation which eminent scientists and inventors helped to establish. Among them was our own colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Because of his interest in the matter and what he told me could be accomplished, I had one of the men from my office go to Boston several weeks ago and personally visit the establishment to see what work is now being done in this field.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon appreciates the statement just made by the Senator from South Dakota, and says that the Senator, as usual,

is thorough and sincere in the job which he is doing.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I note that of the \$400,000 requested, \$63,685 is for personal services; \$15,000 is for travel; \$5,000 is for printing and reproduction; \$306,315 is for other contractual services; \$10,000 is for services performed by other agencies.

As I understand, the facts before us indicate that there is great development all along the line. I am all for the development to try to make fresh water from the sea, so that it can be used along the seacoasts wherever it is possible to use it.

Mr. CASE. Let me say at that point that the program goes further than that. The reason I happened to develop a personal interest in the program is that desalination of water would also make it possible to use what we call alkali water.

Mr. FERGUSON. From wells and streams.

Mr. CASE. Yes. There are a great many towns and small cities which have hard water or alkali water.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that.

Mr. CASE. This program would help them, as well as cities like San Diego, where there has been a great increase in population. I think this program would save some of the money we are called upon to spend to build big dams.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that; but I am also of the opinion that when we pass a law and it goes to the President's desk, and has not yet been signed, we should not appropriate, because it is almost certain that the Department has not been able to set up a proper program for coordination. The Department would require one dollar out of every four for coordination of a program.

In the opinion of the Senator from Michigan the Interior Department and the Bureau of Standards have sufficient appropriations to enable them to look over this program between now and the first of the year, when the next emergency appropriation comes along, so that they will know what they are going to do with the program. As I read the apportionment of funds, \$15,000 would be spent in travel.

Mr. CASE. That is, if they had \$400,000. With \$125,000, of course, they would not.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much would they use for personal services? They ask for \$63,000 for personal services. They are going to make contracts with someone. It does not appear what for.

Mr. CASE. The contracts would be for the research itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why should they enter into contracts for research before they have ascertained all the facts as to what work has already been done? Why should we start engineers and colleges into the research field until we know what has been done? If the Depart-

ment should get this money, it would immediately start to do its own work.

Mr. CASE. It cannot do so under the terms of the bill. It cannot do its own research under the authorizing act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am afraid I shall have to disappoint the Senator from South Dakota.

This bill came from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CASE. It was originally the Senator's bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I introduced the bill to provide authority for the Department of the Interior to study ways and means of removing salinity from sea water. This was done because during World War II the Navy Department, in order to provide fresh water for submarines, conducted a successful program of taking the salt out of sea water. But it was done at a very high cost, justified only by the fact that it was necessary to keep submarines in operation.

As I say, the bill came from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. A bill dealing with the same subject was passed by the House. When the House bill came over here the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] were both on the floor. There was some discussion of the bill, but there were amendments.

There has been no conference. There has been no opportunity for a conference, and no one can tell as yet precisely what will be in that bill unless we accept one or the other of the two bills.

Mr. CASE. Let me say to the Senator that the House concurred in the Senate amendments. The bill, as it passed the Senate, has gone to the White House. So we do know what is in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was all done without the knowledge of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CASE. The bill as it passed the Senate has gone to the White House. It did not go to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill has not been signed by the President. It is not a law. Congress has no basis upon which to judge whether or not it will be signed. In any event, it seems to me to be utterly bad practice to appropriate for legislation which has not yet been enacted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, I should like to say that it has been 2 years since I introduced the original bill. Perhaps it is 3 years, or perhaps it was in the last session of Congress that we first began this drive. If the bill becomes law, then the next Congress, in January, will be able to go into the whole matter, the Department of the Interior will be able to present to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Senate and to the

House a considered program. There certainly was not the time available, in the short hours we had yesterday in considering the supplemental appropriation bill, to act on it in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if it might not be a reasonable solution of the problem and a reasonable disposition of the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee would agree to take the amendment to conference. The bill may be signed or not signed by the time the conferees met. If it is not signed by the time the conferees met, then the point which has been raised may be very valid. However, the appropriation should not be made without authority of law. On the strength of the statement of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, that the bill has been passed by the House and by the Senate, and is now at the White House, it seems to me that if the President should sign it before the conferees meet we would be very well justified in adopting the Senator's amendment. On the other hand, if the President should not sign the bill, then the item could be stricken.

Mr. CASE. I would be very happy to handle it in that way if the chairman of the committee would take the amendment to conference. If the bill is not signed by the time the conferees have completed their action, they could drop it. The Bureau of the Budget has gotten busy and has sent up an estimate for \$400,000, which would indicate a very good attitude on the part of the Executive Office.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. While I know how important it is to find new sources of fresh water all through the arid West—through California and the whole Rocky Mountain area—

Mr. CASE. And in the Pacific Islands.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And in the Pacific Islands. While that is true, it would seem to me that not a great deal more time would be lost by postponing consideration of the matter until next year. What impresses me, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, is the fact that proposals to expend money are being rushed in. We must make some authorizations and appropriations for national defense. We must authorize other expenditures. But it was my feeling that postponeable items could go over.

But the Senator from California is always reasonable. It may be that the conferees could decide the issue. I should like to have some other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs state their opinions. What does the Senator from Oregon feel about it?

Mr. CORDON. I have always felt that amendments should not be added to the bill. I am not at all certain that we know enough about the matter. I do not know enough about it. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who

has made a special investigation, is the only one who is informed on the subject.

Mr. CASE. Others know more about it than I.

Mr. CORDON. If the matter should be pursued reasonably soon, there would be adequate time in the new session. There will be a deficiency bill before us almost before we get into our seats and the new Members are sworn in. When we take up the new program, it will be after study. I believe we should have some study of it. I believe we should know more about what we are doing.

Mr. CASE. If the Senate votes to adopt the amendment, and if the bill has not been signed by the time the conferees complete action, there will be no protest from me if it is dropped by the committee. But I hope that the amendment will be taken to conference.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not understand why it should not be taken to conference. It means a great deal to the United States. Why should it not be taken to conference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota for himself and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. [Putting the question.]

The Chair is in doubt, and will request a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, after line 4, to insert:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation" to be used for construction of Minnesota transmission lines, Missouri River Basin project, \$2,913,600.

Mr. THYE. The reason I offer the amendment for the junior Senator from Minnesota and myself is that as soon as this bill is disposed of the Senate will have before it a conference report on H. R. 7176. In that measure there was an item of \$2,913,600 for a 230-kilowatt line in western Minnesota.

The conference committee did not agree to the item. I know when the question comes up as to whether the conference report should be agreed to, the chances of rejecting the conference report will not be very good. For that reason we are offering the amendment, which proposes an appropriation in the amount of \$2,913,600 for the transmission line in western Minnesota.

The reason why legislation was proposed to construct the transmission line was that when the construction of the dam at Garrison, N. Dak., is completed and the hydroelectric generating units

are installed there will be hydroelectric current available to be wheeled into Minnesota, for use by the consumers in that State.

An installation is being constructed at Randall Dam in South Dakota, as well as at Gavins Point. Those are all flood-control installations on the Missouri River.

As soon as the dams are constructed and the hydroelectric current is generated it will not be many months before the question arises of a steam plant for the purpose of firming up the hydroelectric power.

It is for that reason that those of us who are supporting this project in Minnesota feel so strongly about this question, because, Mr. President, in Minnesota there are excellent steam plants which are generating electricity—not only steam plants owned by private corporations or utilities, but also excellent steam plants owned and operated by the REA. The steam plants now in existence—those owned by the private corporations, as well as those owned by the REA—can be used to firm up power for the hydroelectric installations which are being installed in the flood-control projects on the Missouri River.

This is the first time in all our history that we have found the private utilities, the REA's, and the municipalities standing with the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation in full support of a project.

Why are they in full support of it, Mr. President? Why do the private investors and the private corporation executives support this project, along with the REA's and the Department of the Interior? It is because after making a full and complete study of this project for a year, they have reached the conclusion that if a transmission line is constructed across North Dakota to Fargo, and from Fargo through Granite Falls, Minn., and thence to Mankato, Minn., and thence southwesterly toward Sioux Falls, there will be a complete circuit tying in the Garrison Dam, in North Dakota, and the Fort Randall Dam, in South Dakota, and the Gavins Point Dam at the corner of Nebraska and Iowa.

If there is high water at Garrison Dam, the maximum amount of current will be generated at that point. If there is high water down below, at Fort Randall and at Gavins Point, the maximum amount of current will be generated there. When those three installations are tied together by means of one transmission line, the current can be fed either to the northern end of the project or from the northern end down to the southern end of the project, and at the same time the steam plants which will be able to firm up the hydroelectric power will be tied in.

I think this is the first project on which all the interested parties, including the private investors, the utilities, the municipalities, and the REA's, are standing together.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand this matter, this very amendment has already been rejected by the House this year. I understand that the Senate adopted the amendment, and it went to conference, but the conferees on the part of the House would not agree to it, and the result was that the amendment lost in both places. Is that correct?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Tennessee is correct about the conference committee.

The Senate adopted this amendment, and the amendment went to conference. In the conference, the conferees on the part of the House rejected the appropriation item as voted by the Senate. The conference report is ready to be submitted as soon as action on the pending appropriation bill is completed.

I know that our opportunity and chances to have that conference report rejected, and to request a further conference with instructions to the conferees, are just about zero. For that reason, we have offered this amendment to the pending supplemental appropriation bill, in order that the House may have another opportunity to consider this project.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. THYE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would not it be better for the Senator from Minnesota to let this matter go over until January?

Mr. THYE. The construction is under way at Garrison Dam, and also at Fort Randall Dam and at Gavins Point Dam. Unless these transmission lines are commenced, so that they will be completed and available at the time when the electrical current will be ready to wheel, I do not know what facilities will be available for wheeling the current, once those installations commence to generate electrical current.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does not take as long to construct a transmission line as it does to build a dam.

Mr. THYE. That is a problem, Mr. President.

Let me also call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that the National Grange, the farmers' organization, has recommended this project, and is in full support of it.

The Farm Bureau has recommended this project.

I have before me a telegram from John C. Lynn, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The telegram reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C. July 3, 1952.

HON. EDWARD THYE,

Senate Office Building:

American Farm Bureau Federation recommends appropriation for construction electric transmission lines to serve 20 Rural Electric Cooperatives in Minnesota. We respectfully request that \$2,913,600 be provided

to implement this project before adjournment.

JOHN C. LYNN,
*Legislative director, American Farm
Bureau Federation.*

I also have before me a letter from the National Grange addressed to me. The letter reads as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1952.
Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: The National Grange trusts that you will put forth every possible effort to reinstate the appropriation for the power distribution line connecting the Garrison and Gavins Point Dams on the Missouri River and looping through southwest Minnesota.

This is a splendid example of where both public and private power have joined sensibly in a sound and serviceable program for the benefit of the users of electricity, and it would be a grievous error to kill this item and thus discourage future similar sensible cooperation.

J. T. SANDERS,
*Legislative Counsel,
the National Grange.*

Mr. President, those two farm organizations and also the Farmers' Union have been on record all during the past year in full support of this project.

Now we have an opportunity to bring about cooperation between the private investors, the REA's, and the Department of the Interior, by means of a project which will assure the consumers and users of electricity the lowest possible rate for electric current. In this project we have an opportunity to set a pattern which might well be looked to and copied by other areas of the United States where such transmission lines need to be constructed.

Mr. President, many and many a time I have heard criticism voiced on this floor against the monopolistic trends of the utilities as one charge, and the next charge was that the bureaucratic Department of the Interior was trying to control all the power in the United States.

In this instance we see the Department of the Interior, the utilities, and the REA's standing together and asking for a project, and having the full support of the three major farm organizations in the United States.

Mr. President, 1 year ago I opposed an amendment which my colleague offered in regard to this same project or item. As that time I said we had not studied the question sufficiently to be able to know what we should do regarding this matter. I said that all the interested parties should return to Minnesota and should give consideration and thought to the project, and then should come forward with their recommendation.

The Northern States Power Co., the largest utility in the West, together with the Western Power & Light Co., in western Minnesota, the REA's, and representatives of the Department of the Interior met last December 4 and made a complete study of the project, and came forward with the recommendation which we have submitted to this body.

Mr. President, the Senate has been asked to vote for many a transmission line to firm up power from a hydroelectric unit, and the Senate has been asked many a time to vote for Federal power. I have voted for projects which were not nearly as worthy as this one is.

Mr. President, it seems strange to me that we should not have had any cooperation on this particular project. When the time comes that this current needs to be wheeled, will it be wheeled by private corporations, or will the movement of the current simply come to a dead end, with the result that no one will be served, because of a failure on the part of the Government or a failure on the part of those of us who sit in the Congress to make provision for a transmission line by which to wheel the current to the users, and by which to provide an opportunity to wheel the steam-generated current back into the system when the hydroelectric current is at a low level because of low water on the Missouri River?

All these matters are involved in this amendment, Mr. President.

It is a disappointment to me to find that the House did not give any consideration to the project and did not approve it.

It is for that reason that the two Senators from Minnesota have joined in sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to say in behalf of my colleague that he has presented the argument for these lines persuasively, sincerely, and convincingly. I desire further to document the fact that, unless these lines are constructed, the REA's of our State and similar types of utilities are going to have to do some self-financing. We cannot wait for that.

The Senior Senator from Minnesota, in his years of service in the Senate, has supported the Missouri Valley program. He has supported every one of these transmission-line developments. The junior Senator from Minnesota, in his 4 years in this body, has supported every one of these developments. I have voted for developments in the Northwest, the Southeast, the Southwest, and the Midwest, wherever they might be, because I felt that they were good for America. The Senate, time after time, after conference with the House, has been able to retain transmission lines and power developments. Our State of Minnesota has not had one dollar of Federal funds for hydroelectric power. We have not had one project; and we have 3,000,000 people there, in one of the richest and finest farming areas in America.

As the senior Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, every major farm organization is in support of his amendment. Every single power group in our State, including the REA's, is in support of it, I dare say there are very few States of the Union in which the municipalities, the REA's, the legislatures, the county commissioners, and the farm organizations—and even labor organizations—are all in support of one project.

The senior Senator from Minnesota in the Appropriations Committee has

given his support to many other projects, and I, for one, have tried to support them on the floor.

I simply cannot believe that the Senate would refuse to make provision for these transmission lines, which are so essential. I want to know whether the REA's are supposed to bond themselves, and the Northern States Power Co., and the other private utilities to do likewise in order to extend their own private lines, and then find that they are confronted with a fight with the Bureau of Reclamation. Are the REA's supposed to come here to the National REA office to seek more loans, more power lines, and more generation capacity? We must have the power. We have got to know where we are going, and whether we are going to develop our great State with new production, and new farm land.

We are being told to wait a little bit longer. It is true, we have waited a long time. North Dakota has its power lines, South Dakota has its. We are in the Missouri Valley. This is a logical extension, and it was in the original plan of the Missouri Valley transmission system, but we are being left out.

There is a gap. As the senior Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, this completes the circle. This is a modified plan. It is not the one that was brought in a year ago. It is a very limited plan. It is limited to the basic essentials. I submit that to reject this line now is false economy, because, as the senior Senator has pointed out, if we can tie in the new steam plants, such as the new steam plant at Sioux Falls, N. Dak., and the six plants of the REA generating facilities, we shall be able to firm up hundreds of thousands of kilowatts of electrical power over the Missouri River area. There is not one economic argument against this program. There is no argument I can think of at all against it, except to say that the House of Representatives, or the conferees of the House, will not have it.

Mr. President, let me say we have heard that before; but the Senate has been able to get them to agree. Time after time the House has resisted many such projects, but the Senate conferees have been able to hold out and finally get the projects. I think we are right in seeking the adoption of this amendment; I think we are right in seeking fair treatment. So I believe that this amendment ought to go onto this supplemental bill; that we should try once more. After all, there is no reason at all why it should not be accomplished.

Mr. YOUNG rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator from North Dakota want me to yield?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. The subcommittee on Interior appropriations has had to deal with transmission-line problems in almost every State of the Union. There is usually a conflict between the Bureau of Reclamation and the private power companies as to who should build the lines. In the case of Minnesota, the power companies and the REA co-ops have all agreed. I know of no project in the entire United States that is more justified than this one in Minnesota. I

supported it wholeheartedly in the committee and in the conference with the House. I see no reason why this item should not be taken to conference and one more attempt made to get the House to approve it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I surely want to thank the Senator from North Dakota. I am very much appreciative of his understanding of our problem. I appeal to my colleagues as the senior Senator from Minnesota has done. I appeal to Senators to give us a chance for fair play and equal treatment. After all, the Senate has adopted this before, and why the House of Representatives should continually turn it down is more than I can possibly understand. I have heard as one reason that we should wait a little longer. There is no logical argument for waiting. The project is not going to cost less, in fact, it will cost more; and, worse than that, it will cause the REA's and the private utilities to proceed on their own, thereby creating a duplicate system.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator I should be willing to take the amendment to conference, to see what could be done about it.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We certainly appreciate that, and I want to thank the distinguished chairman for his generosity.

Mr. THYE. I wish to thank the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] for his very splendid remarks in support of this project.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the issue apparently is settled, now, with the distinguished chairman saying he will take this to conference. But, in spite of the very fluent and able arguments made by the two Senators from Minnesota [Mr. Thye and Mr. Humphrey], as a matter of fact, this proposal has been rejected by one conference committee. We have traveled up the hill, and now propose to travel it again. I appreciate the interest of the Senator from Minnesota and his very logical argument.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. The one hope I have is that there will be different conferees on the House side. Perhaps, with a little new blood there will not be quite so many barbs as heretofore, when the committee was giving consideration to this question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, is this issue settled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to put the question.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Thye] for himself and his colleague. [Putting the question.] The Chair is unable to decide, and asks for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority appears at page 21 of the bill. The bill raises the House figure.

I have spoken a number of times on the fact that instead of firming up hydroelectric power in the Tennessee Valley, we have reached the point where there are more steam plants than hydroelectric plants.

When I came to the Senate and heard the debate it was never the intention to do anything else with steam plants than to firm up. That was the whole purpose and the whole idea.

There was an opportunity at Paducah for a number of private-enterprise companies to provide steam power, but the Commission decided against it, and would allow them to furnish only a certain amount. I protest that this is the wrong thing to do in a free-enterprise system.

It now becomes the business of the Government to furnish electric power, and we find that not only the electric business but other businesses are taken over by the Government.

The total number of kilowatts is 1,710,000 for the additional units at Shawnee and other places, and the Authority wants \$150,000,000.

That is just a start, Mr. President. The cost will be \$287,000,000 on completion.

The matter should be called to the attention of the Senate, and I expect, Mr. President, in conference, if I happen to be a conferee, to have it known that I am opposed to this requested increase for the Tennessee Valley by the Government of the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this evening I received a telegram calling attention to a portion of the House report on the bill. For the purpose of clarification of the legislative intent I think it is proper to bring it to the attention of the Senate. The telegram reads:

ABERDEEN, S. DAK., July 3, 1952.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,

United States Senator,

Senate Office Building:

Adoption of House Report No. 2316 on H. R. 8370 restricting allocation of funds by Department of Labor too restrictive on State legislatures. Could prevent changes in State laws to reduce tax burden or extend benefits if such changes resulted in additional administrative costs even though additional costs were small in comparison over-all benefits. Adoption of report could permit Department of Labor to dictate additional standards for State operation and legislation. Just another method of attempting to Federalize State programs. Request you oppose adoption of report.

That is with reference to unemployment insurance.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In our report we have this to say about the matter:

The committee does not agree with the House report directive not to increase any State's allotment pending the study by January 1, 1953, on determination of costs resulting on revision of State laws and regulations during the last 5 years and the benefits resulting from these changes.

So that the Senator can be sure that the Senate does not agree.

Mr. CASE. I am happy to have that statement by the chairman of the committee made a part of the report record.

The statement which was disturbing was this:

Pending its completion the Bureau is directed not to increase any State's allotment because of a change in the State's laws or regulations relating to this program.

Congress has passed a law effecting an extension of social security.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator is wise in bringing the matter up, and I was glad to hear the answer of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, July 3, 1952, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2214) to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2922) to amend subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

RESOLUTIONS OF LODGE NO. 257, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point two resolutions unanimously adopted at the last regular meeting of Lodge No. 257 of the Brotherhood of

Railway and Steamship Clerks located in St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, FREIGHT HANDLERS, EXPRESS AND STATION EMPLOYEES,
St. Paul, Minn., June 27, 1952.
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At our last regular meeting, held June 3, the members unanimously adopted two resolutions to be submitted to our division boards for further processing. The membership requested that a copy of the resolutions be sent you in order to give some idea to you of the sentiments of this local in reference toward tax relief.

"Resolution 1

"Be it resolved, That Local Lodge No. 257 favors the immediate action toward striving to attain the raising of personal income-tax exemption under the present Federal income-tax law from the present \$600 to \$1,200 exemption. Reason for requesting such: The membership feel that big business is given relief in numerous instances and labor is continuing to carry the full load and also should be given some consideration.

"Resolution 2

"Be it resolved, That Local Lodge No. 257 favors including any increase in taxes on incomes in figuring the escalator clause in the cost-of-living index. Reason for requesting: Any increase in taxes on income has the effect of lowering our standards of living when not figured in the cost-of-living index."

Trusting that some thought and consideration on your part be given the above, I remain,

Sincerely and fraternally,
WARREN J. KOPPY,
Recording Secretary, Local Lodge
No. 257, B. of R. C.

RESOLUTIONS OF DELEGATES OF GROUP HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have in my hand two resolutions adopted by the delegates and members at the 1952 annual meeting of the Group Health Association affecting Federal health legislation. These delegates were the authorized spokesmen for more than 100,000 members of the association in Minnesota and Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION III, REGARDING THE HUMPHREY HEALTH BILL, SUBMITTED BY THE SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

Whereas the purpose of the Humphrey bill is to assist cooperatives and nonprofit associations to initiate and carry out voluntary prepaid medical care plans for their members by grants and loans for the acquisition, construction, and equipping of the necessary facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members and delegates of Group Health Association in the annual meeting assembled go on record as favoring this legislation and urge each delegate to so inform their congressional representative.

The supervisory committee moves concurrence and recommends adoption.

RESOLUTION IV, REGARDING FEDERAL AND STATE HEALTH LEGISLATION, SUBMITTED BY THE SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

Be it resolved, That the members and delegates of Group Health Association in annual meeting assembled go on record as favoring the following legislation: (1) Federal aid to medical education, (2) Federal credit and technical assistance to cooperative health plans, (3) enabling legislation in the various States to allow health cooperatives to incorporate, (4) Federal aid for medical research.

The supervisory committee moves concurrence and recommends adoption.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two other resolutions which were adopted by the annual meeting of the Group Health Association attended by delegates from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Washington, at the St. Paul Hotel on April 26, 1952.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE HUMPHREY HEALTH BILL

Whereas the purpose of the Humphrey bill is to assist cooperatives and nonprofit associations to initiate and carry out voluntary prepaid medical care plans for their members by grants and loans for the acquisition, construction, and equipping of the necessary facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members and delegates of Group Health Association in the annual meeting assembled go on record as favoring this legislation and urge each delegate to so inform their congressional representative.

RESOLUTION REGARDING FEDERAL AND STATE HEALTH LEGISLATION

Be it resolved, That the members and delegates of Group Health Association in annual meeting assembled go on record as favoring the following legislation: (1) Federal aid to medical education, (2) Federal credit and technical assistance to cooperative health plans, (3) enabling legislation in the various States to allow health cooperatives to incorporate, (4) Federal aid for medical research.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2079).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 2572. A bill to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries; without amendment (Rept. No. 2081);

H. R. 3209. A bill amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2082);

H. R. 6856. A bill to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2092);

H. R. 7241. A bill to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co., for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull

Shoals Dam; without amendment (Rept. No. 2083);

H. R. 7855. A bill for the improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2084);

H. R. 8127. A bill to amend the Act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2085);

H. R. 8190. A bill to amend the Act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington and Eastern Railroad Co., to construct a bridge across the Calumet River; without amendment (Rept. No. 2086);

H. R. 8194. A bill to amend an Act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 2087);

H. R. 8234. A bill to amend section 5 of the Act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor; without amendment (Rept. No. 2088);

H. R. 8315. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2089);

H. R. 8316. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2090); and

S. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to grant the consent of the Congress to the entry of certain States into compacts and agreements for the improvement of navigation on the boundary waters of States within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River drainage system, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2091).

FEDERAL EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—PERMISSION TO SUBMIT MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3368) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry, and I submit a report (No. 2080) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] be permitted to submit his minority views at a later date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the minority views may be submitted at a later date.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the Senator from Alabama will have the right to submit his minority views at a later date?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That request has been granted.

Speech in the House by Rep. Multer stating that the defense production bill was not good but was better than having no controls at all (pp. A4454-5).

51. APPROPRIATION INVESTIGATIONS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bates discussing his proposed bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide the Armed-Services and Appropriations Committees with staffs adequate to keep them fully informed (p. 4455).
52. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hill discussing the principle of "parity," outlining the history of some of the basic agricultural laws, and commending USDA programs for aid to the farmer (pp. A4458-9).
53. RETIREMENT. Speech in the House by Rep. McDonough favoring an increase in pensions for retired Federal employees (p. A4458).

HOUSE - July 4

54. DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7391 (pp. 9517, 9482-97). The conferees agreed to add cotton and re-processed and reused wool to the provision governing procurement of food and clothing not produced in the U. S.
55. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7289 (pp. 9517, 9498-504). The conferees agreed on a provision that no appropriation may be used for U. S. membership in the International Materials Conference but explained that this does not preclude the State Department from observing the activities as a non-member; fixed the census of agriculture item at \$120,700 (House figure, \$125,000; Senate, \$116,382); and agreed to \$5,750,000 (House figure; Senate, \$5,504,300) for export control, Commerce Department.
56. PERSONNEL RETIREMENT. Received the conference report on S. 2968, to increase the annuities of certain retired Federal employees (pp. 9511-12, 9517).
57. RURAL HOUSING. By a 295-22 vote, agreed to the conference report on S. 3066, to amend the housing laws. One provision of this bill extends the rural-housing program, administered by this Department, for 1 year. (pp. 9450-53.) This bill will now be sent to the President.
58. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 8370 (p. 9451). Senate conferees were appointed July 3.
59. WITHHOLDING PAY. Vacated proceedings of passage on July 3 of S. 1999, providing for the withholding of pay from Federal employees for State and local income-tax purposes, and again passed the bill with a correcting amendment that provided new language (pp. 9447-8).
60. PROPERTY; ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 5350, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (pp. 9464-5). For provisions see item 28. This bill will now be sent to the President.
61. SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 1732, to increase the allotments for school lunches to Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands (p. 9465). This bill will now be sent to the President.
62. RECLAMATION. Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 6163, providing the basis

- for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, and to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues (p. 9506). This bill will now be sent to the President.
63. VETERANS' PREFERENCE. Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 7721, extending the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the armed forces after World War II and prior to July 2, 1955 (p. 9507). This bill will now be sent to the President.
64. CENSUS. Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 7202, to provide that a census of agriculture be taken in Oct. 1954 and the same month in each tenth year thereafter (p. 9507). This bill will now be sent to the President.
65. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 7806, to authorize participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned from abroad for burial (p. 9507). This bill will now be sent to the President.
66. FOREIGN TRADE. Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 6845, to continue until June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, etc. (p. 9508). This bill will now be sent to the President.
67. PATENTS. Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 7794, to revise and codify the laws relating to patents (p. 9508). This bill will now be sent to the President.
68. EDUCATION. Passed as reported H. R. 7494, to encourage the development and growth of the educational fine arts in State and land-grant colleges and other non-profit schools and organizations (p. 9466).
69. WATER COMPACT. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 2470, granting consent for an interstate compact regarding Columbia River waters (p. 9468). This bill will now be sent to the President.
70. PERSONNEL; PATENTS. Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 3975, permitting a Government employee, and his joint patentee, not in government service, who make an invention completely outside of official functions, to maintain a suit against the Government (pp. 9510-11). This bill will now be sent to the President.
71. TRANSPORTATION. Passed with amendment S. 3161, to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements on railroad equipment (p. 9511).
72. FLAMMABLE MATERIALS. The Interstate and Commerce Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) S. 2918, to prohibit movement in interstate commerce of highly flammable wearing apparel and fabrics (p. D706).
73. MISSOURI BASIN. Received from this Department a supplemental report on the Missouri Basin Agricultural Program (H. Doc. 530)(p. 9516).
74. SOCIAL SECURITY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Garmatz supporting H. R. 7800, to increase retirement benefits under the Social Security Act (pp. 9504-5).
75. WEATHER CONTROL. Received the fourth interim report by the Chief of the Weather Bureau on the study of causes and characteristics of thunderstorms; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (pp. 9516-7).

viets have become experts in ideological warfare, the battle to capture the hearts and minds of men. Foreign Minister Vishinsky declared at a Soviet rally in East Berlin, "We shall win the next war not with atom bombs but with our superior brains, ideas, and doctrines."

Today we must not only have a gun in our hand, but a right moral idea in our head, and an answer in our heart.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am unable to understand why the able gentleman from New York assumes the position he does on this conference report. In this bill we have given to the Federal National Mortgage Association the authority to purchase \$900,000,000 of defense mortgages, and it also releases at the same time \$360,000,000 of conventional mortgages. This is a benevolent intrusion by the Government into private enterprise.

Here we have an amendment that will allow savings and loan associations, which are about as American as the American Flag or the Declaration of Independence, to buy certain mortgages. These are splendid institutions.

They can now purchase GI insured mortgages anywhere in the United States. This gives the savings and loan associations the authority to purchase FHA mortgages beyond the 50-mile limit. It lessens the pressure on the Treasury. There is nothing mandatory in the act. It merely gives them the permission to do so. It will more evenly spread the funds available for the construction of homes where there has been a lack of funds in one section and an abundance in another. There certainly is no argument that could be made against it. I think the gentleman is afraid that it might syphon some funds from the great financial center of the Nation and of the world into the rural areas. I do not believe it will do that. I do not think he need have any apprehension. It is an entirely meritorious section, and if you attempt to strike it out you will jeopardize this bill that is so generally asked for by the construction trades in the United States.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Our distinguished chairman who now stands in the well, I know, is sincere in what he says. I know that there are very few Members in this House who have had as much experience with savings and loan associations as he has. He has done a splendid job in fostering and sponsoring them, particularly in his home district; not only legislation involving his own district, but the Nation as a whole. I dislike very much to take a position in opposition to him, but I want to assure him that we have no fear that this will siphon off any money to the rural areas. But I say if you want these savings and loan associations to go into your area, then let them take their money and organize associations for that purpose in your area. They ought to do like the United States Savings and Loan League says they should do; they are

organized in the local communities, intended to operate in the local communities, and I think that is what they ought to do.

Mr. SPENCE. In answer to the gentleman I want to say this; I would not be in favor of savings and loan associations initiating loans beyond the 50-mile limit. The Savings and Loan Association acts as quasi-guardian for those who borrow from it. They see that the money goes into the home, that the contractor is paid, and that the subcontractor is paid, that the material men and the laborers are paid, so there will be no liens upon the property. They see that the construction is done properly. I would not have them initiate a loan beyond the 50-mile limit; I do not think it would be desirable for them to go that far. But, they initiate no loan here; they are merely authorized to buy securities that are insured by the national Government. They now have the authority to buy GI loans, and this only gives them the authority to buy FHA loans which are already made beyond the 50-mile limit. If you give the authority to the national Government, and that is what we did when we authorized the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase \$900,000,000 of mortgages, how could you reconcile this with your refusal to grant this small power to the savings and loan associations and contend you are in favor of private enterprise.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 143]

Abernethy	Gamble	Morton
Allen, La.	George	Moulder
Anderson, Calif.	Hall, Edwin	Murray
Anfuso	Arthur	Nelson
Bailey	Harden	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.	Havenner	O'Hara
Beall	Hébert	Patten
Beckworth	Heller	Poage
Bender	Herter	Potter
Bentsen	Heselton	Powell
Blackney	Hillings	Redden
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Hope	Regan
Brehm	Javits	Richards
Brown, Ohio	Johnson	Rivers
Brownson	Jonas	Robeson
Buckley	Judd	Roosevelt
Buffett	Kearney	Sabath
Burdick	Kennedy	St. George
Butler	Kersten, Wis.	Scott, Hugh D.
Camp	Kilburn	Jr.
Carlyle	King, Pa.	Sheehan
Cole, N. Y.	Klein	Shelley
Combs	Kluczynski	Short
Coudert	Larcade	Sikes
Curtis, Mo.	Latham	Stigler
Curtis, Nebr.	Lesinski	Sutton
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Tackett
Dingell	McConnell	Taylor
Dolliver	McGregor	Thompson, Tex.
Elston	McKinnon	Watts
Ewins	Martin, Mass.	Welch
Fenton	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham
Fisher	Mitchell	Willis
Forrester	Morano	Wilson, Tex.
Fugate	Morris	Wolcott
Furcolo	Morrison	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and nineteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landis, its clerk, announced that the Senate requests the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 5248) to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, with the accompanying papers.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. CANNON, MAHON, THOMAS, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, GARY, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and SCRIVNER.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include on that list the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOUSING ACT OF 1952

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the retirement of our colleague [Mr. McKINNON] of California, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce, as dean of the California delegation, that one of our distinguished Members, CLINTON McKINNON, will be leaving the House at the end of this Congress.

He was first elected to the House of Representatives for the Eighty-first Congress and represented the Thirtieth Congressional District of California, composed of San Diego city and county.

Since being in the House, Mac has distinguished himself in many ways. In the first place, he comes from one of California's largest populated districts—a community that has undergone ex-

ireme impact from World War II and from the Korean build-up. Naturally, that community has many problems and I have had an opportunity to watch Mac handle the multitudinous complications that have come to him from his district. Few Members in my memory have matched the legislative record that this gentleman has performed in getting special bills through for his district and in working with the agencies downtown for the solution of administrative matters.

Water has been one of the major problems of San Diego and Mac has responded with legislation that authorized and financed the construction of a second barrel to an aqueduct that brings Colorado River several hundred miles into his district. Thanks to his good work in Washington, San Diego's water problems are now settled.

The Fallbrook case, which has received national publicity and which involves an equitable division of waters in the Santa Margarita River between the farmers of his district and the huge Marine base, Camp Pendleton, was another problem that came to his office, and he was the author of the well-known Falbrook "Independence" bill that passed the House some months ago and which the other body is now considering.

The scarcity of water in his district prompted him to coauthor another well-known bill, the sea-water bill, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate research activity to bring about commercial development of fresh water from ocean water. This bill also received favorable action by the Congress and is now awaiting the President's signature. The effects of this bill offer untold promise, not only for the citizens of this great country, but for the people of the entire world.

Transportation has been another problem of the San Diego area, and Mr. McKINNON's Laguna tunnel bill, which authorizes the Corps of Engineers to determine the engineering feasibility and economic practicability of a highway and railway tunnel—to be the longest tunnel anywhere in the world—is another page in the legislative record of our good friend from California.

In addition to these bills which MAC authored and pushed through the Congress, he has also been successful in securing Federal prior commitment financing for 9,500 units of privately constructed war housing to take care of the pressing needs for housing. Schools, too, have been an urgent factor, and my colleague was successful in securing allocations of steel for the construction of all needed school buildings in his district.

But while my good friend and member of the California delegation was doing exceptional service for his district, he did not neglect the national and international problems that face this body. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Select Committee on Small Business, and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, he has been a faithful worker and a man who readily accepted the responsibilities this

body imposes upon a Member. If the McKINNON amendment to the original Defense Production Act had been adopted in 1950, the cost of living would be considerably less today and our Government would have saved many billions of dollars in its defense efforts.

While our delegation deeply respects the ability and hard work our colleague has displayed as a Member of the House, the Representatives from California like him even better for his integrity and friendship. He is a man of his word, a loyal friend, and a man never too busy to help another Member.

We Californians realize all too well that we impose our many problems upon this House more frequently than our numbers would indicate, and we are deeply appreciative of your kindly toleration and cooperation. Nonetheless, we are proud of the caliber of our membership, from both the Democratic and Republican side of the aisle. We think our delegation is composed of high caliber men, and the gentleman from San Diego is a good example of what I mean. We are going to miss CLINT McKINNON from our California delegation and we hate to lose him, and I feel that his good work will be missed by the entire House.

As the dean of the California delegation, I want to express the appreciation we all feel for MAC and to extend our sincere good wishes for continued success in whatever fields he goes into as he leaves this body.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the issue today with reference to the conference report raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] strikes me rather favorably. First, I agree with the gentleman from New York that more extended hearings on this particular amendment should have been had, and, secondly, if the amendment would provide and permit savings and loan associations to purchase and invest all of their assets in mortgages all over the country, and none of them locally, I would certainly disagree with the amendment.

It is true that this amendment provides savings and loan associations can purchase mortgages beyond a distance of 50 miles from home. I agree that savings and loan associations are organized and are operated as local institutions with local money to help local people build homes in a particular community; but it does occur to me that occasionally these savings and loan associations find their portfolios in such condition that they are not able to lend money to build homes in the community because they are unable to obtain the money locally. This will permit them under those circumstances to go beyond the present limitation and buy mortgages at a distance greater than 50 miles. I am therefore inclined to believe that the House should accept this amendment at the present time. If, in the future, we find the authority is abused, Congress can correct that situation by

such limiting legislation as may be necessary.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I believe at this late hour we are trying to get legislation through the Congress with every bit of reasonable logic we can apply we should not under the circumstances take a lot of time debating a question of this kind. This is a good conference report which has been given serious and careful consideration by the conferees. I cannot agree with the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and I think in the interest of providing more very much needed housing, his amendment should be defeated.

This conference report is not going to do a bit of harm to anyone, and it is going to do a lot of good to a lot of people. The original Home Loan Act of 1933 provided that these savings and loan associations could not operate outside of the 50-mile limit. Now this does not change that, except in one instance, and that is that they may purchase FHA-insured mortgages outside of their 50-mile limit but they cannot originate loans outside of their 50-mile limit. All they may do is purchase such mortgages. In my opinion it will facilitate the mortgage market to a degree that will provide housing for many, many people that would not otherwise obtain it. It will give the FHA insured mortgage market an opportunity to operate across the Nation. The amendment makes it permissive and not mandatory. I certainly think that we ought to agree to the conference report and expeditiously dispose of this piece of legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that a motion to recommit is not in order, the Senate having acted on the conference report.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, if they did, they acted improperly, because this should have been acted on in the House first.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not aware that the Senate has acted improperly. We have received a message that they agreed to the conference report.

The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 295, nays 22, not voting 113, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

JULY 5, 1952.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8370]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 12, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 35, 41, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 81, 82, 90, and 91.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 69, 70, 71, 74, 83, 85, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100, and agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lines 2 and 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: "to remain available until June 30, 1953,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$15,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum named insert \$262,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: "fiscal year 1953,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and the sum proposed, insert the following: \$88,094,000, of which \$50,000,000 shall be available only for the weapons program; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$27,909,900; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,183,498; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$1,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof \$1,648,275; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$250,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum of "\$600,090,000" insert \$585,510,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum of "\$386,409,840" insert \$361,254,840; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In the third line of the proposed amendment, after the word "programs", insert the following: , *other than those financed from funds contained in this chapter*,; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,875,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,750,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$28,750,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,875,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$60,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$20,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert *Documents Numbered 144, 154, and 157*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows:

Change the section number to "Sec. 1411."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert 1412; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert 1413; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert 1414; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert 1415; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert 1416; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 30, 32, 50, 53, 57, 63, 64, 67, 79, and 87.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON (except
as to amendments
Nos. 86 and 87),

GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2: Inserts formal language in the bill.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5: Strikes from the bill language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Strikes out an appropriation for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 7: Makes appropriation for airport claims as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$5,200,000 for operating expenses of Coast Guard as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$625,000 for retired pay, Coast Guard, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the House.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Amendment No. 10: Provides \$15,000,000 for administrative expenses of Reconstruction Finance Corporation instead of \$14,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$60,000,000 for school construction as proposed by the Senate instead of \$80,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Restores formal language to the bill.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, and 15: Strike from the bill appropriations for pay act costs proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$69,750 for Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Strikes from the bill an appropriation for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$7,500 for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Strikes from the bill an appropriation for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 20, 21, and 22: Make appropriations for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, 25, and 26: Strike from the bill appropriations for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Make appropriations for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$500,000 for hospitals and medical care as proposed by the House instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 31: Corrects a chapter number.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 33: Reinserts a House item for emergency repairs and replacement of buildings and utilities damaged by fire, storm, and flood. Appropriates \$262,500 instead of \$525,000 as proposed by the House. The funds made available are to be used for buildings and utilities only, and not for roads, parkways, or trail construction.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$240,000 for further research and control activities in combating the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes.

Amendment No. 35: Strikes out the amendment of the Senate to provide funds for construction of Minnesota transmission lines. The item has been stricken from the bill with the understanding that it will be given very careful consideration if it is proposed in the budget for 1954.

CHAPTER VIII

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Amendment No. 36: Corrects a chapter number.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Amendment No. 37—*Alterations and repairs, Executive Mansion*: Strikes out the provision of the House providing \$50,000 for extraordinary alterations, repairs, and so forth, of the Executive Mansion and the White House Office, as proposed by the Senate.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, and 40—*Operating expenses*: Appropriate \$88,094,000 for operating expenses instead of \$35,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$141,188,000 as proposed by the Senate, and limit the amount available only for the weapons program to \$50,000,000, instead of \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House; limit funds available for expenses of program direction and administration personnel to \$27,909,900 instead of \$25,064,275 as proposed by the House and \$30,755,526 as proposed by the Senate; and limit funds available for expenses of travel to \$3,183,498 instead of \$2,709,350 as proposed by the House and \$3,657,647 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41—*Plant and equipment*: Restores the proposal of the House appropriating \$1,450,000,000 for plant and equipment, in lieu of the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$1,450,000,000, plus contract authorization for the remainder of the expansion program. In restoring the limitation on the availability of funds for construction as set forth in the House provision, it is the intention of the conferees that funds provided shall be available for the purchase or procurement of machinery, equipment, and materials required for the entire expansion program as submitted to the Congress. The conferees invite the Commission to appear to present additional needs, if any, if the Congress is in session later in the year, or at the new session in January, at which time full consideration will be given to such needs.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 42—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides \$125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Amendment No. 43—*Limitation on administrative expenses*: Strikes out the provision of the House, and inserts the proposal of the Senate, in this connection.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Amendment No. 44—*Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art*: Appropriates \$187,500 for such purpose, as proposed by the Senate.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriate \$150,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$85,000,000 as proposed by the House; and provide \$1,648,275 for expenses of travel instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 47—*Administrative expenses*: Appropriates \$250,000 for such purpose instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

TITLE I—MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 48: Corrects a chapter number.

Amendment No. 49: Inserts formal language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 51—*Department of the Army*: Appropriates \$585,510,000 for military construction, Army. The House had proposed a total of \$600,090,000. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill. The reduction of \$14,580,000 recommended below the House amount represents entire line item projects deleted in the conference agreement on the authorization bill, H. R. 8120, as compared with the House version of that bill.

Amendment No. 52—*Department of the Navy*: Appropriates \$361,254,840 for public works, Navy. The House had proposed a total of \$386,409,840. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill. The net reduction of \$25,155,000 recommended below the House amount represents \$28,527,000 reduced by the conference agreement on H. R. 8120 as compared with the House version; and \$3,372,000 added as provided in H. R. 8120 for naval aviation training at Lincoln, Nebr.

Amendment No. 53—*Naval Supply School, Athens, Ga.*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55—*Department of the Air Force*: Appropriate \$1,200,000,000 for acquisition and construction of real property, Air Force, as proposed by the House. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill.

Amendment No. 56: Restores the provision of the House restricting the use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts within the continental United States.

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Restores provisions of the House restricting the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery, laundry, or dry-cleaning facilities, and prohibiting the establishment or maintenance of a separate supply service for the Air Force.

Amendment No. 59: Corrects a section number.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

Amendment No. 60—*Construction*: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House earmarking \$5,000 for painting a specific building in Alaska.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XI

MUTUAL SECURITY

Amendment No. 65: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Places a limitation on the number of persons employed at per diem rates as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 68: Includes explanatory language of the Senate with an amendment. The committee does not intend that the quantity of American agricultural products or commodities be reduced below that heretofore purchased because of this language.

Amendment No. 69: Strikes out language proposed by the House placing restrictions on employment of personnel.

CHAPTER XII

EMERGENCY AGENCIES

Amendment No. 70: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates \$1,250,000 for Office of Defense Mobilization as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates \$2,875,000 for Defense Production Administration instead of \$2,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates \$3,750,000 for Small Defense Plants Administration instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Appropriates \$1,500,000 for revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates \$28,750,000 for Department of Commerce instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$32,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates \$3,100,000 for Department of the Interior instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Appropriates \$1,875,000 for Department of Labor instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates \$60,000,000 for Economic Stabilization Agency instead of \$57,130,000 as proposed by the House and \$75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 80: Appropriates \$6,500,000 for General Services Administration instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 81 and 82: Appropriate \$8,000,000 for the Federal Civil Defense Administration as proposed by the House instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates \$15,000,000 for Federal contributions as proposed by the Senate instead of \$29,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates \$20,000,000 for emergency supplies and equipment instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

Amendments Nos. 85 and 86: Insert formal language in the bill.
Amendment No. 87: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XIV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 88 and 89: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 90 and 91: Limit the amount which may be paid for automobiles by the Government to \$1,400 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 101: Restores language proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 102, 103, 104, 105, and 106: Correct section numbers.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.



bill (pp. 9545-6).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX - July 4

97. COOPERATIVES. Rep. McCarthy inserted Secretary Brannan's memorandum outlining USDA's policy regarding cooperatives (pp. A4476-7).
98. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Price commending the REA program and stating that "progress that has been made...is a monument to farm people themselves" (pp. A4479-80).
99. INFORMATION. Sen. Wiley discussed the "tremendous power wielded by the executive agencies by virtue of the legions of publicity experts" and inserted a Milwaukee Journal article claiming that the Forest Service sends out publicity materials that are not wanted (p. A4491).
100. COTTON. Rep. Cooley inserted a newspaper editorial commending the efforts of Rep. Abernethy in behalf of the cotton farmers (pp. A4463-4).
101. PRICE CONTROL. Rep. Bolling inserted a Washington Evening Star editorial criticizing the reduction in OCS appropriations (p. A4462).
102. HEALTH. Speech in the House by Rep. Fogarty favoring increased expenditures by the Federal Government for health research (pp. A4461-2).
103. RETIREMENT. Speech in the House by Rep. Springer favoring a cost-of-living increase in annuities of retired Federal employees (pp. A4478-9).
104. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Madden inserted his recent speech before the Indiana Democratic Convention discussing "today's farm prosperity through USDA programs" and commending REA (pp. A4498-500).
105. BUDGETING. Speech in the House by Rep. Colmer urging passage of the bill to create a joint budget committee and provide for additional investigations of the appropriation needs of Federal agencies (pp. A4495-6).

HOUSE - July 5

106. PRICE SUPPORTS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 8122, to continue the dual parity formula through 1955 and to require 90%-of-parity price supports on basic commodities through 1954 (pp. 9761, 9640-3, 9723-4). This bill will now be sent to the President. The conferees agreed to reinstate the 90% provision with an amendment which makes it applicable only to the 1953 and 1954 crops instead of the 1953, 1954, and 1955 crops as provided in the House version. They accepted the sections providing for price support for the 1953 crop of extra-long-staple cotton but with a modification of the basis for determining the level of support from a cost-of-production factor to the relationship between the farm price of long-staple cotton and the farm price of American upland cotton in the 7 years 1936-42 inclusive. (The committee stated that this will result in a support price for extra-long-staple cotton about 2.3 times the support price of short-staple cotton. The conferees changed the penalty rate for long-staple cotton from 50% of the parity price to a penalty of 50% of the parity price or 50% of the support price, whichever is higher. Rep. Hoeven had been appointed to replace Rep. Hill as a conferee on this bill (p. 9687).
107. SUBMARGINAL LANDS. Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 7317, providing for

sale of a tract of SCS submarginal land to Hope, N. Mex. (p. 9687). This bill will now be sent to the President.

108. SOCIAL SECURITY. Both Houses adopted the conference report on H. R. 7800, to increase old-age and survivors benefits under the Social Security Act (pp. 9761, 9644-6, 9724-35). This bill will now be sent to the President. The conferees increased the income limitation to \$75 a month and deleted the Case amendment concerning agricultural workers.
109. CHEMICALS IN FOODS. Rep. Abernethy was authorized to file minority views on the investigation of the use of chemicals in foods and cosmetics (H. Rept. 2356, part 2), and the Select Committee on this matter submitted its report (pp. 9691, 9751).
110. ECONOMIC GROWTH. Rep. Burnside spoke on the economic growth of W. Va. in the last 20 years including the improved situation of the farmer (pp. 9708-12).
111. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 8370, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 9746-50). The conferees agreed to the Senate amendment (with a clarifying provision) to the House amendment (by Rep. Whitten) regarding sale of agricultural commodities, but stated that "The committee does not intend that the quantity of American agricultural products or commodities be reduced below that heretofore purchased because of this language." The conferees also fixed the appropriations for Defense Production Administration at \$2,750,000, Economic Stabilization Agency at \$60,000,000, and Federal Civil Defense Administration at \$8,000,000; and fixed the price which may be paid for automobiles at \$1,400. The provision for a transmission line in Minn. was stricken "with the understanding that it will be given very careful consideration if it is proposed in the budget for 1954." The House concurred in the Senate amendments to provide \$190,000 additional for SCS water conservation and utilization projects and \$125,000 for sea-water research through the Interior Department.
- Later the Senate rejected the conference report on this bill and asked for a further conference on the amendments in disagreement. The House subsequently adopted the second conference report. The "Daily Digest" states, "Action on this further conference was pending when this issue went to press, and it is our understanding that the Senate recessed until Mon., July 7, without completing action on this measure. (pp. 9746-50, 9774-83, D708, D710.)"

SENATE - July 5

112. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7289 (pp. 9622-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.
113. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, returned the bill to conference for further consideration of amendments which had been reported in disagreement, and agreed to the second conference report (pp. 9634-40, 9751, 9784). This bill will now be sent to the President.
114. PERSONNEL RETIREMENT. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on S. 2968, to provide for increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act. The conferees increased the limitation to \$2,160 yearly, made the increases effective through June 1954, and added the Secretary of Defense to the committee that will make a comprehensive survey of the retirement systems. (pp. 9622, 9675-6.) This bill will now be sent to the President.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF BURIAL GROUNDS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6891) to provide for the acquisition, restoration, and maintenance of the burial ground of 256 Maryland heroes of the American Revolution and erection of a suitable memorial.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire through purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise, the plot of land in Brooklyn, N. Y., in which 256 Maryland soldiers killed in the Battle of Brooklyn on August 27, 1776, are buried, and any adjoining land as is necessary, in his opinion, to establish a suitable cemetery in their honor. The Secretary shall erect an appropriate national memorial on such land, and shall restore, maintain, and care for the graves of these gallant soldiers.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make an investigation and report thereon to the Congress at not later than March 1, 1953, with respect to the advisability of establishing a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y., in honor of 256 Maryland heroes who fell in combat during the Battle of Brooklyn on the 27th day of August 1776. The report to the Congress shall include information regarding the following:

- "(1) National historical importance of such a memorial;
- "(2) Nature of burial site, identity of exact site of burial, size and present-day conditions of site, including improvements thereon;
- "(3) Complete cost for the establishment of such memorial;
- "(4) Cost of maintenance of such a memorial and amount thereof that will be paid for by the city of New York and/or the State of New York; and
- "(5) Recommendations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO CERTAIN LAND IN MARION COUNTY, IND.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7262) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable

materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to donate, convey, release, and relinquish to Charles O. Grinslade, Sr., Indianapolis, Ind., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land located in Marion County, Ind. Such land, which was acquired by the United States in 1942 and reconveyed to William Ozman on May 16, 1946, subject to a reservation to the United States (pursuant to Executive Order No. 9071, dated March 4, 1946) of all fissionable materials therein, contains approximately seven and one-tenth acres and is more particularly described as follows:

Block "A" in the Joe Maloof Addition, sections 1 and 2, an addition to the city of Indianapolis, Marion County, Ind., as per plat thereof, recorded in plat book 27, page 80, in the office of the Recorder of Marion County, Ind.

With the following committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 4, inclusive, and insert "That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land located in Marion County, Ind., is hereby released and relinquished to and for the benefit of the lawful owner or owners of such land."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7555) relating to the exchange of land for purposes of the Colonial National Historic Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to improve the area and the administration of the Colonial National Historic Park, in the State of Virginia, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to accept on behalf of the United States land or interests in land within the authorized park area as heretofore delimited by the Congress, and, in exchange for the property so accepted, to convey to the grantors any federally owned land or interests in land situated within the Colonial National Historic Park, of approximately equal value.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KLAMATH TRIBAL LOAN FUNDS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3363) to authorize a depository for Klamath tribal loan funds.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 872-873; 25 U. S. C. 530-535, inclusive), is amended to permit the Secretary of the Interior, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, to advance funds from the reimbursable loan fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, to the Klamath Tribal Loan Board for deposit in a depository or depositories designated by him, for the purpose of making loans and paying administrative expenses. All repayments and accruals on loans hereafter made by the Board may be deposited in the depository or depositories designated by the Secretary, and shall be available for making loans and paying administrative expenses under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to advance funds from the reimbursable loan fund established by section 2 of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 872, 25 U. S. C., sec. 531), as amended, to a bonded officer of the Klamath Tribal Loan Board upon request of the general council of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians (hereinafter referred to as the "Klamath Tribes"), for deposit in a National or State bank or banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and designated by the Board. Disbursements from the bank depository may be made by a bonded representative of the Klamath Tribal Loan Board for payment of administrative expenses of the Board, and for the purpose of making loans to members and associations of members of the Klamath Tribes for any purpose which will promote their economic development, for educational advancement, for financial assistance in cases of illness, death, or other emergency, and for the maintenance and support of the aged, infirm, and incapacitated members.

"SEC. 2. Repayments on loans made by the Klamath Tribal Loan Board from its bank depository under section 1 of this Act, and interest, service fees, and other charges on such loans shall be deposited in the bank depository and be available for further loans by the Board, and for the payment of administrative expenses.

"SEC. 3. Acceptance of funds by the Klamath Tribal Loan Board pursuant to this Act shall relieve the Secretary of his trust as to funds advanced and accruals thereto."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DRY FALLS DAM

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 74) to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dry Falls Dam.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project shall hereafter be known as Dry Falls Dam and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name South Coulee Dam shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of Dry Falls Dam.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1953

Mr. CANNON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2494)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 12, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 35, 41, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 81, 82, 90, and 91.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 60, 61, 62, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 74, 83, 85, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 2 and 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "to remain available until June 30, 1953,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum named insert "\$262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "fiscal year 1953"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and the sum proposed, insert the following: "\$88,094,000, of which \$50,000,000 shall be available only for the weapons program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$27,909,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment "\$3,183,498"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$1,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,648,275"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$600,090,000" insert "\$585,510,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$386,409,840" insert "\$361,254,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the third line of the proposed amendment, after the word "programs" insert the following: ", other than those financed from funds contained in this chapter,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$28,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$60,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "Documents Numbered 144, 154 and 157"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: Change the section number to "Sec. 1411"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1412"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1413"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert: "1414"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1415"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1416"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The Committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 30, 32, 50, 53, 57, 63, 64, 67, 79, and 87.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON (except
86 and 87),
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2: Inserts formal language in the bill.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5: Strikes from the bill language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Strikes out an appropriation for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 7: Makes appropriation for airport claims as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IV

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$5,200,000 for operating expenses of Coast Guard as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$625,000 for retired pay, Coast Guard, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the House.

Government Corporation

Amendment No. 10: Provides \$15,000,000 for administrative expenses of Reconstruction Finance Corporation instead of \$14,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$60,000,000 for school construction as proposed by the Senate instead of \$80,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Restores formal language to the bill.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, and 15: Strikes from the bill appropriations for pay act costs proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$69,750 for Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Strikes from the bill an appropriation for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$7,500 for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Strikes from the bill an appropriation for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 20, 21, and 22: Make appropriations for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, 25, and 26: Strike from the bill appropriations for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Make appropriations for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$500,000 for hospitals and medical care as proposed by the House instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 31: Corrects a chapter number.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 33: Reinserts a House item for emergency repairs and replacement of buildings and utilities damaged by fire, storm, and flood. Appropriates \$262,500 instead of \$525,000 as proposed by the House. The funds made available are to be used for buildings and utilities only, and not for roads, parkways or trail construction.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$240,000 for further research and control activities in combatting the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes.

Amendment No. 35: Strikes out the amendment of the Senate to provide funds for construction of Minnesota transmission lines. The item has been stricken from the bill with the understanding that it will be given very careful consideration if it is proposed in the budget for 1954.

CHAPTER VIII—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Amendment No. 36: Corrects a chapter number.

Executive Office of the President

Amendment No. 37—Alterations and repairs, Executive Mansion: Strikes out the provision of the House providing \$50,000 for extraordinary alterations, repairs, and so forth, of the Executive Mansion and the White House Office, as proposed by the Senate.

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, and 40—Operating expenses: Appropriate \$88,094,000 for operating expenses, instead of \$35,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$141,188,000 as proposed by the Senate, and limits the amount available only for the weapons program to \$50,000,000, instead of \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House; limit funds available for expenses of program direction and administration personnel to \$27,909,900, instead of \$25,064,275 as proposed by the House and \$30,755,526 as proposed by the Senate; and limit funds available for expenses of travel to \$3,183,498, instead of \$2,709,350 as proposed by the House and \$3,657,647 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41—Plant and equipment: Restores the proposal of the House appropriating \$1,450,000,000 for plant and equipment, in lieu of the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$1,450,000,000, plus contract authorization for the remainder of the expansion program. In restoring the limitation on the availability of funds for construction as set forth in the House provision, it is the intention of the conferees that funds provided shall be available for the purchase or procurement of machinery, equipment and materials required for the entire expansion program as submitted to the Congress. The conferees invite the Com-

mission to appear to present additional needs, if any, if the Congress is in session later in the year, or at the new session in January, at which time full consideration will be given to such needs.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 42—Salaries and expenses: Provides \$125,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 43—Limitation on administrative expenses: Strikes out the provision of the House, and inserts the proposal of the Senate, in this connection.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 44—Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: Appropriates \$187,500 for such purpose, as proposed by the Senate.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriates \$150,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$85,000,000, as proposed by the House; and provides \$1,648,275 for expenses of travel, instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

War Claims Commission

Amendment No. 47—Administrative expenses: Appropriates \$250,000 for such purpose, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Title I—Military Public Works

Amendment No. 48: Corrects a chapter member.

Amendment No. 49: Inserts formal language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 51—Department of the Army: Appropriates \$585,510,000 for military construction, Army. The House had proposed a total of \$600,090,000. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill. The reduction of \$14,580,000 recommended below the House amount represents entire line item projects deleted in the conference agreement on the authorization bill, H. R. 8120, as compared with the House version of that bill.

Amendment No. 52—Department of the Navy: Appropriates \$361,254,840 for public works, Navy. The House had proposed a total of \$386,409,840. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill. The net reduction of \$25,155,000 recommended below the House amount represents \$28,527,000 reduced by the conference agreement on H. R. 8120 as compared with the House version; and \$3,372,000 added as provided in H. R. 8120 for naval aviation training at Lincoln, Nebr.

Amendment No. 53—Naval Supply School, Athens, Ga.: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55—Department of the Air Force: Appropriate \$1,200,000,000 for acquisition and construction of real property, Air Force, as proposed by the House. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill.

Amendment No. 56: Restores the provision of the House restricting the use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts within the continental United States.

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Restores provisions of the House restricting the constructing, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery, laundry, or dry-cleaning facilities, and prohibiting the establishment or maintenance of a separate supply service for the Air Force.

Amendment No. 59: Corrects a section number.

Title II—Department of the Army
Alaska Communication System

Amendment No. 60—Construction: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House earmarking \$5,000 for painting a specific building in Alaska.

CHAPTER X—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XI—MUTUAL SECURITY

Amendment No. 65: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Places a limitation on the number of persons employed at per diem rates as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 68: Includes explanatory language of the Senate with an amendment. The committee does not intend that the quantity of American agricultural products or commodities be reduced below that heretofore purchased because of this language.

Amendment No. 69: Strikes out language proposed by the House placing restrictions on employment of personnel.

CHAPTER XII—EMERGENCY AGENCIES

Amendment No. 70: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates \$1,250,000 for Office of Defense Mobilization as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates \$2,875,000 for Defense Production Administration instead of \$2,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates \$3,750,000 for Small Defense Plants Administration instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Appropriates \$1,500,000 for revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates \$28,750,000 for Department of Commerce instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$32,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates \$3,100,000 for Department of the Interior instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Appropriates \$1,875,000 for Department of Labor instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates \$60,000,000 for Economic Stabilization Agency instead of \$57,130,000 as proposed by the House and \$75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 80: Appropriates \$6,500,000 for General Services Administration instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 81 and 82: Appropriates \$8,000,000 for the Federal Civil Defense Administration as proposed by the House instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates \$15,000,000 for Federal Contributions as proposed by the Senate instead of \$29,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates \$20,000,000 for emergency supplies and equipment instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XIII—CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

Amendments Nos. 85 and 86: Inserts formal language in the bill.

Amendment No. 87: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XIV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 88 and 89: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 90 and 91: Limit the amount which may be paid for automobiles by the Government to \$1,400 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 101: Restores language proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 102, 103, 104, 105, and 106: Correct section numbers.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. VAUGHN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. CANNON (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

[Mr. CANNON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the bill was under consideration in the House a motion was made to strike certain language that appeared on page 25 of the print of H. R. 8370 in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission, which was in the nature of a proviso. We have on the news wires the indication that a letter has been written to the Speaker of the House by the President of the United States, and I have obtained a copy of that letter. It reads as follows:

JULY 5, 1952.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am informed that the supplemental appropriation bill, as reported from conference, contains a rider which, in effect, forbids the Atomic Energy Commission to start any specific construction project unless funds are available to complete the project; and that the amount of funds carried in the bill for the atomic energy program is less than half the amount I requested.

This rider and reduction in funds, coupled together, would mean that the Atomic Energy Commission would not be able to fulfill military requirements for atomic weapons. I cannot believe that the Congress would wish to adjourn with our national security jeopardized in this fashion.

I urgently request that this rider be eliminated before the Congress completes its action on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I will not consent to dispensing with further reading of the conference report unless the report in reference to item 41 concerning the plant and equipment for the Atomic Energy Commission be read. The reading of the balance may be dispensed with as far as I am concerned. If the gentleman will make his request in that form I will not object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has reserved the right to object and states that if the statement with reference to amendment No. 41 is read he will not object to dispensing with the further reading of the report.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think we will save time by reading the statement. I withdraw my request that it be considered as read.

The Clerk continued the reading of the statement.

Mr. McDONOUGH (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield me sufficient time to make a statement in reference to amendment 43 at this time, I would appreciate it. I want to know just how I can obtain the time? Is it in order to ask for that time now?

The SPEAKER. No, not at this time, because the statement of the managers on the part of the House is being read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the statement.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, when this bill passed the House there was an amendment added to restrict the use of funds for the Public Housing Administration, and the language that the House put in the bill was corrected in the Senate and the conference, I understand, has accepted the language of the Senate. In the language of the Senate the words are almost identical to the House amendment with the exception, beginning on line 8, page 29, after the word "has" there appears the word "tendered." In the interest of those communities that have projects that may want to cancel out, it may be interpreted that the word "tendered" means that the money advanced is immediately on hand at the time the cancellation is made. I was intending to submit an amendment to this conference report, but I do not want to do that under the circumstances, and in light of that I would like to get an interpretation of the intention of the committee and the Congress as to the meaning of the word "tendered." I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], who is the chairman of the

Subcommittee on Independent Offices under which this bill passed when it went through the House if he will not agree that it is the intention of Congress that the word "tendered" as it appears here means to negotiate a satisfactory agreement between the Federal Government and the city, county, or State to tender or deliver to the Federal Government full reimbursement for the funds advanced on such project prior to cancellation of previous commitments.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman has made a good interpretation. That makes good, common horse sense.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Would the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], agree with that interpretation?

Mr. TABER. I would say that that was the proper interpretation of the language and the intent of the Congress.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, it would not be necessary for any community, if the amount was \$10,000,000 or more, to have the \$10,000,000 on hand at the time the agreement was made, to deliver the \$10,000,000 at a future date.

Mr. TABER. I should say that they should agree to it and go through the normal process of raising the money.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I would like to ask a further question on that particular point, because I think it is very important. This is subject to possible misinterpretation, I believe, and that is why I think it is essential that it be made perfectly clear as to the intent of the Congress. "Tendered" might be interpreted by someone to mean that the municipality or the city must be in a position to put down a certain set sum of money. I believe that it has been satisfactorily said that "tendered" might well be intended to mean the intent on the part of the city to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion for the discharge of the obligation which is due the Federal Government. Is that the understanding?

Mr. THOMAS. That is certainly a good definition of "tendered." I do not think you will have any trouble with that.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is clear to me that it was the intention of the House that the language submitted here be just as favorable to the municipalities on the "tendered" proposition as was the language which was adopted in the House.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 3, line 22, insert the following:

"CAPITAL OUTLAY, SEWER DIVISION"

"For an additional amount for 'Capital outlay, sewer division,' to remain available until June 30, 1954, \$1,200,000, including

such additional amount as may be necessary for the preparation of surveys, plans, and specifications in connection with the construction of storm-water and relief sewers."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike the word "additional" in line 4 of said amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 4, line 21, insert the following:

"Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1953: To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1953, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police, \$156,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment number (4) page 5, line 4, insert

"Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery of \$300 for each Senator and the President of the Senate for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, \$29,100, to remain available for obligation until January 2, 1953."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the motion as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"For an additional amount for inquiries and investigations, Committee on Appropriations, \$250,000.

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES"

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Committee on Appropriations Resolution Numbered 11, adopted by the committee on July 2, 1952, \$250,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, is it in order at this time, or at any later time to offer a motion to recommit to strike that item?

The SPEAKER. The conference report has been agreed to. The motion to recommit would be too late.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is there any motion to recommit that can be made at this or any later time?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, can we not ask for a division on this?

The SPEAKER. Of course, a vote can be taken on any motion that is made.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 119, noes 13.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30, page 22, line 1, insert:

"CHAPTER VI"

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE"

"SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE"

"Water conservation and utilization projects"

"For an additional amount for 'Water conservation and utilization projects,' \$190,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment number (32) page 22, line 10, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY"

"Research in the utilization of saline water"

"For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of H. R. 6758 (as amended and passed by the Senate and House of Representatives) authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, \$125,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY"

"Research in the utilization of saline water"

"For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of Public Law 448, approved July 3, 1952, authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, \$125,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment number (50) page 31, line 22, insert:

"Military construction, foreign countries"

"For establishment and development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries as authorized by the act of ———, \$140,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the motion as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Military construction, foreign countries

"For establishment and development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries, \$140,000,000, to remain available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 53: Page 33, strike all of lines 18 down to line 25, and insert:

"Naval Supply School, Athens, Ga., rehabilitation of existing facilities and new construction, \$2,030,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 57: Page 35, strike out all of section 803.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and insert in addition thereto the following:

"Any appropriation available to the Department of Defense shall be available for mustering-out payments as authorized by law."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 63: Page 37, line 4, insert:

"CORPS OF ENGINEERS

"Rivers and harbors

"Rivers and harbors: For an additional amount for 'Rivers and harbors,' including the objects specified under this head in the 'Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953,' \$5,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 64: Page 37, line 10, insert:

"Flood control

"Of the funds available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, not more than \$450,000 shall be available, until expended, for the planning, construction, and furnishing by the Corps of Engineers of adequate elementary and high-school facilities in the new combined municipality (commonly referred to as Newtown) in North Dakota, which is for the acquisition of and to replace the school facilities in the villages of Sanish and Van Hook, N. Dak., which are located within areas acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on said river,

conditional upon Newtown School District No. 1, Mountrail County, N. Dak., wherein such now combined municipality is located, contributing to the cost of such planning, construction, and furnishing the maximum amount of money which can be provided through a bond issue within the general debt limitation permitted by law for such school district."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 67, page 53, line 6, insert *"including not to exceed \$186,900 for salaries and expenses for operating a publicity office in the District of Columbia."*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert *"including not to exceed \$186,900 for personal services for those persons in a publicity office of the Mutual Security Agency in the District of Columbia the major part of whose activities is the dissemination of information in the United States and for expenses incident to the dissemination of such information."*

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 79: Page 61, line 6, insert *"Provided further, That subparagraph (B) of section 204 (f) (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:*

"(B) In any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, village, or unincorporated area; and"

(2) of section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which makes the declaration specified in paragraph (1) (b) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 87: Page 64, line 1, strike out *"\$6,489,954"* and insert *"\$1,121,563."*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment

of the Senate No. 87, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by said amendment insert *"\$6,743,026."*

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks relative to the retirement of Hon. WILLIAM G. STIGLER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

(Mr. CHELF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in tribute to Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON.)

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, this last day of the session of the Eighty-second Congress is a rather sad one. Far too many of our able and distinguished Members are leaving us. I am informed that nearly 40 duly elected Members of this House of Representatives are voluntarily relinquishing their seats to return to the private life of a citizen. I am told by old timers who have served here for many long fruitful years that this is the largest number ever to leave in any one session of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Kentucky, the Honorable THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, who has so ably and effectively represented the Third Congressional District of Kentucky, the gateway to the South, that great city of Louisville, is among those who have seen fit not to seek reelection. THRUSTON B. MORTON has been a credit to old Kentucky during his outstanding service in this House. He has approached all legislative problems in a courageous and conscientious manner. He has supported legislation in committee and upon the floor of this House that was to the best interests of all Kentucky, the Nation and toward securing a balanced, honorable and everlasting peace throughout the world. I can never recall a single instance where THRUSTON ever let politics sway or influence his good, sound judgment.

In such times of peril, when the peace of decent, honest, God-fearing, liberty-loving peoples of the world is at stake, this House—this Nation—can ill afford to lose men of his sterling character, his vision, his honesty, and his ability. My colleagues, when this House is losing such outstanding men as MORTON, DOUGHTON, GORE, KERR, HEDRICK, EATON, SASSER, LEONARD W. HALL, HENRY LARCADE, PICKETT, RAMSAY, STIGLER, FUGATE, BECKWORTH, MCKINNON, ANFUSO, J. CALEB BOGGS, J. M. COMES, ELSTON, GRANGER, HERTER, HENRY JACKSON, KENNEDY, MIKE MANSFIELD, POTTER, HARDIE SCOTT, STOCKMAN, WOOD, TACKETT, WELCH, LEONARD ALLEN, and many other good and competent legislators far too numerous to mention—it makes one shudder. It is a frightful toll upon our

I say that when any Member of Congress calls to the attention of any member of the Cabinet an irregularity on the part of an employee of the Cabinet member's department and asks for an investigation of the employee, and in fairness to the employee is willing to withhold his name pending the investigation which I think should be done, that Cabinet officer has the responsibility of answering the Member of Congress. That responsibility has not been met by the executive officer in charge of the great tax-collecting facilities of this country and as long as this administration continues to allow these culprits to merely resign for reasons of health I shall have no confidence in their intentions to clean house.

Resignations merely mean that these men are being placed on retirement for life in many instances.

Instead of cooperation in cleaning up this corruption all I have received from the executive branch is denunciation. They speak out in support of clean government but their actions belie their words.

To clean up the question of who has been financing campaigns indirectly out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of every ruling which has been furnished by the Treasury Department in response to my request, purportedly covering every ruling that has been made in the last 20 years with reference to any political party. Every one of the rulings refers to members of the Democratic Party.

There being no objection, the rulings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1950.

HON. JOHN E. MANNING,
Collector of Internal Revenue, Post Office
and Courthouse, Newark, N. J.

MY DEAR MR. MANNING: Reference is made to your letter dated September 12, 1950, in which you request advice with respect to a letter from Mr. John J. Dickerson, chairman of the New Jersey Republican State Committee.

In his letter Mr. Dickerson states that the New Jersey Republican State Committee is sponsoring a dinner in Atlantic City on September 30, 1950, and that a question has arisen as to whether or not the purchase of tickets would constitute a deduction for Federal income tax purposes. Mr. Dickerson further states that it is his understanding of the State law that if the taxpayer can clearly show that the purchase of the ticket was in the ordinary course of business and if his business was benefited thereby, he is entitled to deduct the cost of the ticket as a business expense.

It appears that the view expressed by Mr. Dickerson is based upon his belief that the purchase of the tickets in question may be deducted under section 23 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code as an ordinary and necessary business expense. The application of this provision of the law, however, depends upon the existence of facts which have not been given by Mr. Dickerson, such as the purpose in the purchase of such tickets and the use to which the money so expended will be put. It is well established that political contributions are not deductible. See section 29.23 (q)-1 of Regulations 111; *Textile Mills Securities Corporation v. Commissioner* ((1941) 314 U. S. 326, C. B. 1941-2, 201; I. T. 3276, C. B. 1939-1 (Part I), 108). On the

other hand, contributions made by local tradesmen to business or civic organizations for the purpose of attracting and playing host to conventions or similar gatherings which will draw sizable numbers of guests and visitors to the community, may be deducted provided that such contributions are made with a reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount contributed. See section 29.23 (a)-13 of Regulations 111, and I. T. 3706, 1945, C. B. 87. Accordingly, if the tickets are purchased to support the political aspects of the occasion in question (as distinguished from the business aspects attendant on obtaining new money and customers from the event, regardless of its nature), a deduction is not allowable.

Since the occasion for which the tickets are to be purchased is apparently a political one, it cannot be assumed that the purchase of such tickets by a business concern will give rise to a deduction.

Mr. Dickerson also asked to be advised whether or not a corporation is permitted to purchase tickets. Since this question concerns matters not necessarily in the jurisdiction of the Bureau and detailed information is not furnished, it does not appear to be appropriate for comment by the Bureau.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

APRIL 19, 1950.

MR. STUYVESANT PEABODY, JR.,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. PEABODY: Reference is made to your inquiry as chairman of the Chicago Host Committee for National Jefferson Jubilee to be held in Chicago on May 13, 14, and 15, 1950, with respect to whether contributions made to the committee by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in business in the city of Chicago would be deductible for Federal income-tax purposes.

You state that the Chicago Host Committee is playing host to thousands of guests who will participate in extensive panel discussions pertaining to the issues of the day. It is also intended to pay tribute to Thomas Jefferson through parades and pageants depicting his contributions to the welfare of our country. It is expected that the thousands of guests and visitors spending 3 days in the city of Chicago will bring new money into the community and will benefit the business of the community.

The contributions from local tradesmen are solely intended to defray the expenses to be incurred in playing host and running the above-mentioned functions. It is understood that the contributions referred to in your letter will not be used to defray the expenses of the political aspects of the event.

On the basis of the information submitted, it is held that contributions made to the Chicago Host Committee for National Jefferson Jubilee by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in a trade or business in the city of Chicago would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, in their Federal income-tax returns, provided that such donations are made with a reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of the donations.

Very truly yours,

GEO. J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

JULY 26, 1951.

MR. WILLIAM NEALE ROACH,
Assistant Treasurer,
Democratic National Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROACH: Reference is made to your letter of July 12, 1951, transmitting a letter from Mr. Wilson Gilmore, presi-

dent of the Young Democratic Clubs of America requesting a ruling concerning the deductibility by corporations of contributions to the Young Democratic Clubs of America for their convention.

He has stated that such clubs will hold their national biennial convention at the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis, Mo., on October 4-6, 1951. In order to defray the large amount of expenses that will be incurred by the convention program, they are seeking contributions. It is stated that it has been their idea to organize a convention corporation under the benevolent corporation laws of Missouri and to obtain a pro forma decree for this nonprofit corporation. Such corporation would be the recipient of all convention funds and would pay all expenses and attend to all other official business of the convention. After the convention such corporation would be dissolved. A ruling is requested as to (1) whether contributions from corporations would be deductible by them for Federal income-tax purposes as business expenses if given to the Young Democratic Clubs of America, and in the alternative (2) whether such contributions would be deductible if given to the proposed convention corporation.

On the basis of the information submitted it is held that contributions for the purposes of the convention made to either the Young Democratic Clubs of America, or in the alternative to the convention corporation when organized by corporations engaged in a trade or business in the city of St. Louis and its environs would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code in the Federal income returns provided that such donations are made with reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of donations.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

MAY 18, 1949.

MR. DAVID A. SCHULTE,
Care of Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SCHULTE: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner dated April 26, 1949, in which it is stated that you have received an offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York, hereinafter referred to as committee, of 10 percent of the face amount of a note of the committee in full settlement thereof. The letter dated April 8, 1949, from Mr. Carl Sherman, treasurer of that committee making such offer was submitted with the letter of April 26, 1949. In the absence of a power of attorney authorizing Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner to represent you this letter is being addressed to you.

A ruling is requested as to (1) whether the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift; and (2) whether the loss incurred by your acceptance of said offer would constitute a nonbusiness bad debt loss.

It is stated that in 1944 you were asked to lend the committee \$50,000; and that you were assured that after the campaign in 1944 the note would be gradually repaid as different finance programs made funds available. The \$50,000 was loaned to the committee and you were given a promissory note in that amount. Such note has not been paid, and the committee has informed you that it would be unable to make payment on the note or to its other note-holding creditors, but that it has been promised sufficient money to offer in settlement 10 cents on the dollar to all of its creditors.

The committee has also informed you that its principal creditor, Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, has accepted its offer and received

payment, and that Mr. Marshall Field, another noteholder, had also consented to accept the offer.

Based upon the information submitted it is the opinion of this office that acceptance of the offer of the committee will not, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift, and that the loss resulting from such acceptance will be considered as a nonbusiness bad debt within the meaning of section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. McLARNEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

MAY 18, 1949.

Mr. MARSHALL FIELD,
Care of Mr. Howard A. Seitz,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. FIELD: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Mr. Howard Seitz, your attorney, dated April 15, 1949, in which it is stated that you have received an offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York, hereinafter referred to as committee, of 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of a note of the committee in full settlement thereof.

A ruling is requested as to (1) whether the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift; and (2) whether the loss thus incurred by your acceptance of the offer of settlement would be considered a nonbusiness bad debt loss.

It is stated that in 1940 you were asked to lend to the committee the sum of \$50,000. The loan was made and you accepted a promissory note. The matter of payment has been discussed with the committee, and the officers of the committee have informed you that they have insufficient funds to make payment. In December 1948 you were informed by the committee that it would be unable to make payment of the note to you or its other note-holding creditors. You have decided to accept the offer of settlement of 10 cents on the dollar.

You have been informed that Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, the principal creditor of the committee, has already accepted a similar offer of the committee, and that Mr. David A. Schulte, another creditor, has consented to do likewise.

Based upon the information submitted it is the opinion of this office that acceptance of the offer of the committee will not, for Federal income-tax purposes, constitute a gift, and that the loss resulting from such acceptance will be considered a nonbusiness bad debt within the meaning of section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. McLARNEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

DECEMBER 30, 1948.

Mr. RICHARD J. REYNOLDS,
1206 Reynolds Building,
Winston-Salem, N. C.
(Attention Mr. Stratton Coyner.)

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Mr. Stratton Coyner, attorney, dated December 28, 1948, in which it is stated that you have received a final settlement offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York of 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of unpaid demand notes issued by the committee, which you now hold for collection.

A ruling is requested as to whether (1) the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income-tax purposes, constitute a gift, and (2) the loss representing the difference between the aggregate face value of the notes and the amount received in full settlement would be considered as a nonbusiness debt.

The letter states that you now hold the following notes of the Democratic State Committee of New York:

Note dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand, signed by Carl Sherman, treasurer, \$75,000.

Note dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand, signed by Carl Sherman, Treasurer, \$100,000.

Note dated October 14, 1944, payable on demand with interest after demand at rate of 1 percent, signed by Carl Sherman, Treasurer, \$96,000.00.

Note of Democratic State Committee of New York dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand to Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, endorsed without recourse by the Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, by (not stated in letter), \$39,110.45.

The notes presently held by you are represented to have been issued in consummation of a series of transactions involving advances to the Democratic State Committee of New York. In all transactions it is represented that the advances were in the nature of loans inasmuch as notes were received as evidence of the obligations incurred by the committee. The representations in respect of advances made over a period of years extending back to the year 1940, the notes issued in respect of the obligations and the payments made on such notes are fully disclosed in the letter of your attorney.

It is stated in the letter that you were assured at the time the loans were negotiated that repayment of the loans, fully covered by demand notes, would be made on an annual basis. Subsequent events, however, precluded the committee from discharging, as contemplated, the several notes issued as evidence of its obligation to repay the advances made by you. It is stated further that demands have been made at various times for the payment of the notes which have resulted only in the receipt of renewal notes.

The possibility of instituting legal action against the committee, it is stated, was of no avail inasmuch as reducing the notes to judgment and throwing the committee into bankruptcy would have accomplished nothing toward the payment of the obligations. Furthermore it is stated that the Democratic State committee of New York has no assets of any consequence and no uncollected enforceable pledges. A certified page from the official report of the Democratic State committee of New York dated November 2, 1948, showing the outstanding loans payable by that committee has been submitted, and supplementary thereto, it is stated that the Democratic State committee of New York has only a small bank balance of less than \$5,000 and office furniture for four offices and a reception room in the Biltmore Hotel in New York City.

It appears that your demands for payment of the notes finally resulted in the submission of an offer on the part of the Democratic State committee of New York to pay in full settlement, in cash, 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of the outstanding notes. The offer is contained in a letter addressed to you under date of December 23, 1948, and signed by Mr. Carl Sherman, treasurer, Democratic State Committee of New York.

In view of the representations and data submitted it is concluded that (1) the acceptance of the offer of the treasurer, Democratic State Committee of New York, would not, for Federal income-tax purposes, constitute a gift, and (2) any loss incurred resulting from such acceptance would be considered as a nonbusiness debt within the meaning of section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. McLARNEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

APRIL 24, 1951.

Mr. BARNET HODES,
Secretary of Citizens Committee To
Bring the Republican and Democratic
National Conventions to Chicago, 1952,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. HODES: Reference is made to your letter of April 11, 1951, requesting an opinion from the Bureau of Internal Revenue concerning the deductibility by corporations of contributions to the Citizen's Committee To Bring the Republican and Democratic National Conventions to Chicago, 1952.

You have stated that the Citizen's Committee is a nonpartisan committee which will play host to thousands of guests who will come to Chicago if the conventions are held there. New money will be brought into the community, which will benefit business of the community. In the sample letter to be sent out to prospective contributors it is stated that the tentative plan is to obtain, as soon as possible, the necessary subscriptions, one-half to be paid not later than December 1, 1951, and the remaining half not later than March 1, 1952. If only one convention is obtained, then half the subscription is to be canceled, and if neither convention is obtained, then the entire subscription is to be canceled.

On the basis of the information submitted, it is held that contributions made to the Citizen's Committee To Bring the Republican and Democratic National Conventions to Chicago, 1952, by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in a trade or business in the city of Chicago and its environs would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code in their Federal income-tax returns, provided that such donations are made with reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of the donations.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 46 and 53.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion. [Putting the question.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.
The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, with reference to this conference report, the

President of the United States has sent a letter to the Vice President, which was previously read. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the letter again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the letter.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

JULY 5, 1952.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,

President of the Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am informed that the supplemental appropriation bill, as reported from conference, contains a rider which, in effect, forbids the Atomic Energy Commission to start any specific construction project unless funds are available to complete the project; and that the amount of funds carried in the bill for the atomic energy program is less than half the amount I requested.

This rider and reduction in funds, coupled together, would mean that the Atomic Energy Commission would not be able to fulfill military requirements for atomic weapons. I cannot believe that the Congress would wish to adjourn with our national security jeopardized in this fashion.

I urgently request that this rider be eliminated before the Congress completes its action on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that we cannot delete the proviso in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission. It was my clear understanding, however, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who disagreed with the rider in committee today, as I recall that it would not prevent the Atomic Energy Commission from starting its third large plant, and would not prevent their buying certain machinery and other equipment necessary to be acquired for the purpose of proceeding with the third plant. I do not know where the third plant is located. It is somewhere in the Mid-West.

I do not want to have any misunderstanding that the rider on the bill—and I understand the conferees agree with my statement; and all I am trying to do is to make legislative history—will prevent the Atomic Energy Commission from proceeding with the third plant, because they can use funds which are now available. Therefore, it is not a question of providing any more money. It is a question presented by the rider which provides that unless they can complete something, they cannot start it.

My understanding from the House conferees is that perhaps this could be started, and later on be completed. But we do not want 6 months' delay; we do not want delay until January, when we shall return.

I wish to make clear for the legislative record that this rider does not affect the subject of the President's letter to the distinguished President of the Senate; this rider does not say that we cannot

move forward in our atomic energy program.

Some of the Senators who are members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy perhaps will speak later. Among the Senators who are on the joint committee is the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who appeared before the Appropriations Committee, as did the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is the ranking minority member of the independent offices appropriations subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I wish to say that it is our understanding that the Atomic Energy Commission can go forward with its program, and can go forward with the third plant, and can go forward with what is necessary at Oak Ridge, and can go forward with what is necessary at Savannah Valley, and can go forward with what is necessary at Paducah, under the provision to the effect that certain sections of the installations—of course, I do not have the exact provision in front of me—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am confident that the legislative history of this proviso should be made clear.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I was trying to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I appreciate that. That should be done, because the President has been misinformed. His letter conveys entirely the wrong idea.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that I do not think the President has been misinformed. Unless we make clear the legislative history—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina request unanimous consent that he may yield to the Senator from Michigan, to permit the Senator from Michigan to make a statement?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not want the Senate to think the President has been misinformed. The President is right.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am making this statement with all due deference to the President, for I do not mean this as any criticism at all.

The President has in mind that there are large projects—for instance, let us take a hypothetical one, which would consist of various buildings, various power plants, railroads, and different kinds of buildings. There might be 10, 15, or 20 buildings in a project for the production of atomic energy.

Here is what the President has in mind:

I am informed that the supplemental appropriation bill, as reported from conference, contains a rider which, in effect, forbids the Atomic Energy Commission to start any specific construction project unless funds are available to complete the project; and that the amount of funds carried in the bill

for the atomic-energy program is less than half the amount I requested.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it is not a question of money; I simply do not want this proviso to stop the third big plant.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to show how the proviso will not stop the project. Let me refer to the language of the proviso. I am a member of the committee of conference, and I speak as a member of the committee of conference, just as does the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. I think we should make the legislative history clear.

Here is the proviso:

"Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project."

All that means is that if they have enough money to erect a building, and if they can go ahead and construct that building, or if they have enough money to build a utility, they can build it, no matter how large or how small it may be; or they can, in that way, build any other specific part of the program.

There is no intention on the part of the House of Representatives, as I am sure the legislative history will show, to hold up this whole program merely because the Commission does not have available billions of dollars with which to complete it. The situation simply is that the House of Representatives does not want to give contract authority for the commencement of a building or a utility or something of that kind if sufficient funds are not available for the construction of such building or utility.

There is talk of entering into a contract with a utility. Most of these contracts are with the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Tennessee Valley Authority will enter into a contract. There will not be any question. The contract can be made for a year. It is not necessary that a contract be made with the TVA for 50 years, and that all the money required for a 50-year contract be available at this time.

I believe this legislative history ought to be made clear; and it is clear that there is no attempt on the part of the House or on the part of the Senate to hold up the whole project because the Commission does not have enough money to build a particular building. The restriction applies only to a particular building in the project, a specific part of the project—a particular building or a particular utility.

In other words, when we appropriate \$1,450,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission, we realize that Congress will be in session next January, no matter what happens, and that the appropriation now being made is enough to enable the Atomic Energy Commission to begin any building in any of the three projects or in any further development.

I wish to be of help to the atomic energy program.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Michigan is eminently correct. He was

a friend of the Commission in the conference today.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was only trying, as is the Senator from Michigan, to make the legislative history clear, so that they can go ahead.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, so they can go ahead. I am in favor of this program; I have favored all the appropriations for the atomic-energy program, and I do not want the Commission or the program to be held up by anything that is said here on the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I simply wish to make the legislative history clear. I wish to have it clearly understood that this rider will not hold up the Commission's program.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. All we are seeking to do is to make the legislative history clear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, who first requested that I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, I should like to join with the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Michigan. I do not like this proviso. In the conference we tried to delete the proviso, but the House would not yield on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The conferees on the part of the House explained the position of the House. The position of the House is substantially as it has been explained by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MAYBANK. I see the distinguished Senator from Michigan talking now to a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New York.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the question is one of interpretation of the language, namely, whether the words "a project" are to be interpreted as meaning a great big entity, or whether, under the language of the proviso, the words "a project" are to be interpreted as meaning any specific portion of a project—in other words, whether the words "a project" mean a particular building or a particular utility or any other specific portion of a project.

One billion four hundred fifty million dollars is appropriated for this purpose. Personally, I should like to have seen the appropriation substantially larger than that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Both the Senator from Massachusetts and I suggested \$2,500,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, I agree. However, that is not the issue which is before us at the moment.

The principal issue at the moment is as to the proviso. If the proviso is interpreted as not meaning a great big project, such as one of the two or three the Commission may be building, but is interpreted as meaning perhaps one building, perhaps one-one hundredth of any one of these projects, then the Atomic Energy Commission will have all the money it can spend between now and January. It already has all the authority it needs to make plans.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Atomic Energy Commission already has all the authority it needs to proceed with the construction and to purchase the equipment if the provision is interpreted in that way; and I hope and I trust that it will be interpreted in that way.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have just one more comment to make.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, Mr. President, the making of the plans would be a specific portion of the project, and, in my judgment, would not be subject to the limitation. I hope that is clear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senate left out the proviso, but the House was adamant on keeping the proviso in the bill.

I agree with them that the Atomic Energy Commission is no longer a growing child. It is now a full-grown man, so to speak.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is a maverick.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It must be able to look forward, for its new construction, a little more accurately than it did in the case of its past construction. So there is merit in that suggestion.

But the language is limiting, and it must be interpreted liberally. I, for one, hope the Atomic Energy Commission will interpret it liberally. If the Commission does interpret it liberally, I, as one Member of Congress, will support the Commission in that interpretation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that the conferees on the part of the House stated exactly that; namely, that the restriction or limitation was to cover individual items, but not the whole project. The Senator from Massachusetts recalls that, I am sure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was one of their arguments, namely, that it was not a limitation on the whole project, but was a limitation only on whatever was being built. For example, let us assume there were a plan of some kind costing \$100,000,000. They would have plenty of money for it. They have \$1,450,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the Senator will remember that we put in the full amount that was required for the TVA for power.

Mr. MAYBANK. That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina whether it is not true that, under this vast atomic-energy program, a single gaseous fusion plant can run into hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not necessary then, under this amendment, that \$1,000,000,000 be earmarked for that plant before a cent of it could be used?

Mr. MAYBANK. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. MAYBANK. We are endeavoring to make it absolutely clear, that that is not the case. The machinery can be bought, the land can be cleared, the pipes can be bought under the contract authority.

Mr. MOODY and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield further to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. My distinguished friend from South Carolina said, as I understood him, that he opposed the proviso, and my colleague from Michigan said he opposed it. The Senator from Massachusetts also said he opposed it. I should like to have it explained here tonight, by Senators who have been defending it. I should like to have an explanation of the purpose of this amendment, if it means anything.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was a proviso to the House amendment, from which the House conferees refused to recede, and the instructions of the conference were—and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], was in charge—that we were to write into the report a statement that this could not happen, and that, with the proviso as it was changed, as shown by the report, it could only apply to certain parts of a total plant. So it is possible for them to start any plant they want to start, tomorrow. As I remember, the appropriation was \$1,450,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. MOODY and Mr. HAYDEN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield further to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, here we are in a race for our survival—

Mr. MAYBANK. We shall win the race for survival if we make the proper legislative history and get this program going.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to know the purposes, if I may, of putting a brake on the atomic energy program.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I think I can help him answer that question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. The conferees representing the Senate—and I was one of them—made it perfectly clear that heretofore it had been impossible to get detailed information from the Atomic Energy Commission as to its plans, and as to what it intended to do. It was decided that this had been going on long enough, and that there ought to be a better business arrangement and a better understanding between the Congress and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Therefore, this provision was included. It was explained. We said that we did not know whether it was going to have a crippling effect or not, that, when it was thoroughly settled that any particular item or any particular project could be approved, inasmuch as the total amount could be expended between now and the next session of the Congress, it would be possible to spend more than a billion dollars. There is ample money with which to start any particular feature or any particular project that is necessary. Under those circumstances, we agreed. That was the understanding, and it is so written into the report. I want to confirm all that has been said by the Senator from Michigan, by the Senator from Massachusetts, and by the chairman of our committee. That was our understanding.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who did more than all the rest of us put together to try to work it out as it was worked out.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER rose.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I want the floor in my own right. I want to make a speech on this matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask our esteemed colleague from South Carolina whether I am correct in my belief that the clause referred to is in the House amendment to Senate amendment 41, the last proviso, "Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation will be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion."

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the clause referred to. I appreciate the desire of the Senate members of the conference to create a favorable legislative history in this matter.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was only after we were defeated in the effort to knock out this proviso that we yielded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. I may say I appreciate the desire of the Senate members of the conference committee to create a favorable legislative history, which will permit the interpretation which the members of the committee have attached to this proviso.

Mr. MAYBANK. And the House has agreed with us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The courts have always held that legislative history does not have precedence over a statute itself, but that the statute is controlling. Therefore, before I would accept this legislative history, I would want to be clear on the meaning of this provision. I do not know how much of this material is classified, and how much is not classified.

Mr. MAYBANK. Unfortunately, too much of it is classified.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask a further question while we are on this point?

Mr. MAYBANK. I stated that the House agreed thoroughly with what we did.

Mr. HAYDEN. Entirely so.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let us suppose there is a series of plants—I will not say what type of plant—but let us suppose there is a series of plants, the first of which would cost \$1,400,000,000, the second of which would cost a very large sum, and the third of which would also cost a large sum. What I fear is that with this House proviso, instead of starting all three plants simultaneously with the appropriation given, only the first plant could be started, and it would be impossible to start the second and third plants.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from South Carolina yielded to me for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am an outsider, asking these questions.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is such a complicated question that I would not be able to answer it, but I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois—because this entered my mind in connection with his questions—that it is my understanding that we may assume that there are three projects, each involving, let us say, \$500,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would be safe. But suppose one of them involves \$1,450,000,000, that another involves \$500,000,000, and that another involves \$500,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This proviso, if the Senator will read it—and I shall be glad to supply it to him if he does not have it—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have it before me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will note that the language is "a building, utility, or other specific portion of a

project." I agree that it may be a slightly liberal interpretation, but it is my interpretation—my hope, anyway, and my understanding that if, let us say, three large projects are contemplated each of them could be started. There might be 10 buildings built in 1 project, 10 in another, and 10 in a third—they might not be able to start work on 30 buildings in 1 project, 30 buildings in a second project, and 30 buildings in a third project—and they could keep them all going until the matter came back to the Senate next January.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I first yield to the Senator from Wyoming, a member of the committee who has worked on this all day long.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] I may say that what the committee understood about this language is that the word "or" appears throughout. Every lawyer and every grammarian knows that the word "or" has a different effect from that of the word "and." I read:

No part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project—

That means that these three subjects are separate—any building, or any utility, or any specific portion of a project—unless funds are available for the completion of—

What?—

of such building or such utility or such other specific portion of a project.

Let us consider the largest possible project one may have in mind. There is a specific portion of it. It could be the east wing, or the south wing, or the north wing, or it could be the basement. It could be any specific portion. The only purpose of this language as presented to us in the conference with the House was to make it certain that the Atomic Energy Commission would not be launching upon a vast project far beyond anything that had been presented to the Congress in justification of the appropriation.

I say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] that when this matter was first called to my attention and before I had the opportunity of reading this proviso, I was inclined to think that the proviso should be taken out, and I feared that unless it were taken out it might cause great danger to the progress of development of atomic energy. But when I listened to the explanation of the House members of the conference and when I read the proviso and saw the word "or" I lost all fear about it.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Wyoming a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. My distinguished friend from Wyoming has read that the money shall be available for the construction of any building, any utility, or other specific portion of a project. In other words, the money must be there for the construction of the building. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. Bear in mind that there has been appropriated \$1,400,000,000. Bear in mind that this is the 5th day of July. Bear in mind that Congress will be back in Washington on the 3d of next January. Bear in mind that it is physically impossible for the Atomic Energy Commission to spend that large amount of money between now and January.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not a fact that under this proviso the Commission could not contract for the construction of a gaseous diffusion building if it were necessary?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It could contract for the building of such a plant, or for the building of a utility, or the building of specific projects. Of course it could.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator does not let me finish my sentence. If a billion-dollar plant were to be contracted for, that would leave how much for the rest of the program?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is disregarding the word "portion."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in helping to make the legislative history clear I think it would be helpful to have in the RECORD the words of the chairman of the House subcommittee who was the author of this proviso. He is quoted in a press report on the ticker. I read:

Chairman ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat, of Texas, of the appropriations subcommittee which handled AEC funds said the rider would not "hamstring or slow down" the atomic-energy program.

THOMAS told newsmen that the position was aimed at forcing the AEC to come up "with reasonably definite plans and specifications."

He claimed that AEC was asking for "a blank check," but that careful planning and specifications could save up to \$500,000,000 "and some time, too."

Thomas insisted that Congress had "no disposition to slow them down or stop them."

He insisted that Congress was asking only that "they come up with definite plans and specifications."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator served in the House along with the distinguished Representative from Texas. Congress does not intend to slow up anything.

Mr. CASE. That is true. It happened to be my privilege to work on the first appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission. When the first money was appropriated for the Manhattan District project I was a Member of the House. We dealt with Army engineers.

I followed it through the course of the war. I was a member of the subcommittee on independent offices appropriations. I was the majority member of

that subcommittee at the time I left the House. I know something of the difficulty in appropriating for the Atomic Energy Commission. They started out with something for which they could not draw a blueprint.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. The whole history of the legislation has been to try to get the language a little more specific. All the rider does is to say very simply that "you shall not start a portion of a project unless the money is available." I have been told this evening by a distinguished member of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative TABER, of New York, that the committee was told by the Atomic Energy Commission that they could not obligate, between now and April 1, more than \$600,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. The committee has provided two and one-half times as much as the Commission said it could obligate itself for in connection with the construction of a gaseous diffusion plant.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator knows that it takes a long time to develop such a plant.

Mr. CASE. They can start units of it under this language.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND rose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think we might well learn a lesson from what occurred tonight. If the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate continue to try to legislate on appropriation bills, we may as well do away—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, that has nothing to do with the matter which we have been discussing.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator does not want to yield to me, I shall speak on my own time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly; the Senator should speak on his own time. I do not want anyone to think that we are legislating on an appropriation bill. The House had a right to put such provisions in with reference to the expenditure of the funds. I shall conclude by reading from the report:

Amendment No. 41—Plant and equipment: Restores the proposal of the House appropriating \$1,450,000,000 for plant and equipment, in lieu of the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$1,450,000,000 plus contract authorization for the remainder of the expansion program. In restoring the limitation on the availability of funds for construction as set forth in the House provision, it is the intention of the conferees that funds provided shall be available for the purchase or procurement of machinery, equipment, and materials required for the entire expansion program as submitted to the Congress. The conferees invite the Commission to appear to present additional needs, if any, if the Congress is in session later in the year, or at the new session in January, at which time full consideration will be given such needs.

That is all I have to say.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee, who is in charge of the conference report, was on his feet earlier

in the evening. The Chair thinks that if the Senator wishes recognition—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was on my feet asking for recognition. The Chair does not have any right to say who is going to get the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona knows it is the custom for the Chair to recognize those who are in charge of a bill or a conference report.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; and it is also the custom to recognize the majority leader when he rises to ask recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is welcome.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as I was saying a few moments ago, when we attempt to legislate on appropriation bills, it is a serious matter. Most of the trouble in the Senate tonight has been due to attempts to legislate on appropriation bills. The only result is that it leads to trouble. The Senate has rules against such a practice, and the rules should be observed. It makes no difference which House does it, whether the House or the Senate. It is worse when the House does it, because when the bill comes to the Senate, the question then is one of germaneness. When we vote on germaneness, there is no limit to what can be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Not at present. I will yield in a few minutes.

Mr. President, a serious question confronts the Senate this evening, as to whether the provision in controversy would permit to be done the things that should be done. Members of the Atomic Energy Commission and members of the Atomic Energy Committee say that the provision is not sufficient. I merely wish to say that I would rather spend all night here than to do something that would jeopardize the defense of this Nation.

We can talk about explaining the legislative history. We should not be compelled to do so. It is plain, and should speak for itself.

I do not intend to take any more time. I want the distinguished Senator from Iowa, who is a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, to explain the position of the committee. Much of the testimony has been taken in secret. I say that in times like these we cannot afford to play with the defense of America.

Perhaps some money has been wasted. The chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], has been sending messages from his bedside because he is terribly worried about the situation that is presented to us this evening.

It is all very well for Senators to take the floor and say that this provision is sufficient. But suppose it is not sufficient. Are we willing to take a chance? We could have sent the bill back to con-

ference in the time that has already been consumed in trying to state the legislative history.

I hope the Senator from Iowa will make his explanation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe the proviso is legislation. The proviso is only a limitation, and is within the province of the Appropriations Committee. It should be clear that this particular proviso is not legislation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Many crimes are committed in the name of limitations.

I do not wish to use any more time. I want to hear what the distinguished Senator from Iowa has to say about the provision. I know that what he has to say will come from the depths of his heart, and will reflect what he thinks is best for the Nation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have no desire to take the time of the Senate tonight unduly. I would not have sat around all evening and missed my dinner in order to be sure to be here when this proposal was before the Senate; I would not have asked every senior member of the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to be here this evening; I would not have asked my old friend, Representative DURHAM, who is Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, one of the most zealous and informed men on the subject there is in Washington, to be here; I would not have spoken to the Senators on this side of the aisle, and a great many on the other side, more than I have on any other piece of legislation since I have been in the Senate, if I had not thought we were facing a very important and critical time in a most important and, in many ways, novel atomic energy development in this country, and if I had not thought that the proviso in the bill, regardless of legislative history and interpretation by individual Members or committee members, did not, in fact, stymie the adequate development of the program. I think it does.

I will say now that I think the bill must go back to conference, and that by some legerdemain we must get the House conferees to realize that they are doing a disservice to American defensive power by retaining this proviso in the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the proviso says that—

No part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available—

The words are "no part"; it does not say "half of it"; it says "no part"—shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

That is just as plain as language can be. To prove how plain it is, I shall read from the Appropriations Committee hearings on the bill. The exact date is not shown, but the hearings were held this summer.

This very provision was before the Appropriations Committee. This is the way the Senator from South Carolina

[Mr. MAYBANK] interpreted it at that time. With respect to this same language, he said:

Senator MAYBANK. You could not start any part of the total program, if I may say so.

Mr. DEAN. I think that is a question—whether you could start.

Senator MAYBANK. I would say that.

Senator HILL. You could not start unless what you started could be finished with all the money in this bill.

Senator MAYBANK. That is right.

Senator MCCARRAN. That does, not require much interpretation. This language seems very clear.

Mr. President, the atomic energy program has a great deal of mystery about it. It has a great deal of secrecy about it, and necessarily so. But I assure Members of the Senate that the atomic energy program is not a static program. It has never been, and it will not be, for the foreseeable future. The atomic energy program is a rapidly changing and developing program. Science is reaching out into the unknown. The nuclear scientists never know from month to month what those reaching fingers will find out in the mists of this new science. Seldom does a quarter go by that some plans or programs do not have to be discarded because experience has shown that they might have been slightly on the wrong track or that the emphasis might have been misplaced, so that the scientists have to back up or go ahead with greater emphasis, depending upon what their discoveries are.

We have reached further into the unknown in atomic energy than man has ever gone in science, and we have only started to tear the veil aside. The program we are discussing, and to which this prohibition applies, is a package program. I am not privileged to discuss the details of that program on the floor of the Senate. They come under the category of things which the Atomic Energy Commission and our defense people believe should be kept quite secret in their details; but I assure Senators that the program is a package program. It is a \$3,100,000,000 program which must be started, if it is to be economically successful, as a general entity. It cannot be successfully started piecemeal. It is like starting to build an automobile. We may say, "We will build the motor this year, and next year we will build the rear axle, and the year after that we will build the transmission. Then after a while we will get around to building the wheels."

If we are to have an automobile within a reasonable time, we must build the automobile, the axles, the frame, and every other part, so that the car will be in operation when the package project is completed.

But if it is built piecemeal, the end results, which are power for the defense of this country, will be delayed and delayed. I am not going to tell Senators how long the delay would be, but there is no question that there would be delay in the end result, which is power for the defense of this country—and more power than any of us, or all of us put together, could possibly imagine. Power for the defense of this country will be unduly and perilously

postponed; make no mistake about that. I make this statement not as a partisan politician, not as a Republican or a Democrat. I say that speaking for every one of the 18 members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have been living with this problem.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to conclude.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to ask a question at that point.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand that all the members of the Joint Committee agree upon that statement?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me be completely specific—

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to know the answer to that question. The Senator has the information.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me be completely specific. Let me check with the vice chairman of the committee, Representative DURHAM. I think there were about 12 Members present the other day. At any rate, about two-thirds of the Members were present. Others had been consulted. I had in my pocket the proxies for several Members if it had been necessary to use them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is giving us his best information.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator that I am sure that no member of the joint committee opposed the resolution. Every member who was present was vitally interested. The action was unanimous. I had the right to vote about five proxies, if it had been necessary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wished to be reassured. I think other Members of the Senate would like to be reassured.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The action was unanimous.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That statement carries great weight with me. I do not know much about the subject. The Senator and his colleagues are members of the committee. They have information which other Senators do not have. I am interested in the defense and security of the country, and I want to know the answers to some of these questions. Can this risk be taken? If it is the judgment of the committee that it cannot be taken, I should like to have that fact definitely stated.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assume that any risk can be taken. The risk is not only unwarranted, but may be costly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me put it this way: Would it be prudent, under all the conditions, to take the risk?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It would be utterly imprudent to take the risk.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I want to know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am speaking this evening for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, because I am the only member of the committee who is present on the floor of the Senate. I have asked Representative DURHAM to come over. He is vice chairman of the

committee. So I must speak for the committee.

The joint committee was so concerned about this matter 2 or 3 weeks ago that we held a meeting and passed a special resolution, which was unanimously agreed to, that we would earnestly request the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate not to include this rider. This is not an ordinary proposition. It is not like constructing buildings in units. In constructing buildings, one unit can be used after it is built, and another unit can be built and used. This project is like an automobile. If it is going to run, we cannot build the motor today, the rear axle next month, the wheels next Michaelmas, and expect it to operate by the time the motor is built. We must build it as a package project, if we are to have an operating vehicle.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. The distinguished Senator from Iowa has said that this is a package program, which would cost approximately \$3,000,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Slightly more than \$3,000,000,000—three billion three or four hundred million. I cannot give the exact amount.

Mr. MOODY. As I understand, the appropriation in this bill calls for about half that amount.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It calls for approximately \$1,400,000,000.

Mr. MOODY. So if the Senate should foolishly consent to this proviso, it would mean that only about half the atomic-energy program could be started. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We believe so. The Atomic Energy Commission and its lawyers believe so. The joint committee is united in its opinion that that is so.

I wish to make clear to the Senator from Michigan that it is not a question of whether \$1,400,000,000 or \$2,000,000,000 is appropriated now. In my judgment the extra \$600,000,000 would not accomplish anything, because there would still be the proviso. I think this statement can be verified by those who are familiar with the situation. The extra \$600,000,000 in the appropriation would not accomplish anything, because there would still be the proviso that the program cannot be started unless all the money is in hand to pay for it. As I say, this project ought to be a package deal.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not a fact that unless we want to put the brakes on our atomic energy program we must appropriate \$3,000,000,000 instead of one and one-half billion?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; we do not have to appropriate \$3,000,000,000. All that it is necessary to do is to take the rider off.

Mr. MOODY. The alternative to taking the rider off would be to double the appropriation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, yes. If we want to appropriate approximately \$3,400,000,000 and leave the rider on,

that is all right. But so long as we leave the rider on and appropriate only half the money, the job cannot be done.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMahon], chairman of the joint committee, has devoted a great deal of time to this subject. He is ill and unable to be on the floor at this time. He has sent to me a statement which he asks me to read into the RECORD so that he may be on record in this matter. He says:

I am distressed and alarmed to learn that the destructive and crippling rider directed at the atomic energy program has been left in the bill as reported by the conference committee.

I very much hope that the Senate will act to recommit the bill, for purposes of eliminating this rider; for I have been assured by the Chairman and General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission that the program will be seriously delayed if the rider stands.

We are dealing here with issues of war and peace. If the rider becomes law, and therefore threatens our capacity to prevent war, I shall have utterly no alternative except to request the President to call the Congress back into session for purposes of enabling the atomic program to go forward as asked by the President, the National Security Council, the Defense Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Atomic Energy Commissioners.

Mr. President, I have before me a statement released by the office of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which reads:

In response to a joint committee inquiry, Mr. Gordon Dean, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, made the following comment upon the action of the House in cutting atomic-energy funds by more than one-half and in adopting a rider which provides that the AEC cannot start a project unless it has on hand the funds to complete it:

"I am confident that if the Congress understands the effect on our production of this proviso on construction, it will eliminate the language. Under this proviso we cannot achieve the weapons production which the program was designed to accomplish.

"The purpose of the expansion program is to get more bombs in a hurry. Weapons material would begin to flow from these plants in less than 2 years.

"You cannot say in one breath that you are blessing the total expansion program, then cut the fund for that program more than one-half, then slap on a rider that we can't start any project until we have the money for it without at the same time saying that we can't start the total program. The fact is that we could start only half of it."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, all through that statement which the Senator from Iowa has read the reference is to the starting of a project. As I read the rider, it refers to a portion of a project.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would say to the Senator from South Dakota that we have had interpretations given us. I believe the Committee on Appropriations is utterly sincere in believing that this does not handicap the atomic energy program. I think they believe that they are sound in their interpretation. I would not accuse any member of the committee of desiring to injure the program. They have always tried to help it. However, it is the deep conviction of the Commission, the joint committee, and

those of us who have examined the rider that it is in fact a complete block to the beginning of a package program.

Before I conclude my remarks I wish to say that the \$3,000,000,000 program is not the entire atomic energy program. We are making substantial progress on atomic energy. It is something that is vitally needed to be developed with speed and with strength.

No one has criticized waste and mismanagement in the atomic energy program more than I have. There is no one who will criticize it quicker than I will. There is no one who is more nonpartisan in his attitude toward atomic energy development than I am.

Mr. President, I say to you that I earnestly believe, the joint committee earnestly believes, and the Commission earnestly believes, that the \$3,000,000,000 program which is so important and so vital must be started as a package program for its ultimate efficiency and its ultimate success; and that this rider as it now stands will hamper that program and hamper or slow down the day of realization of its final efficiency and success, and will postpone that day to a period which may be unwise in the light of future events.

I say, to the majority leader, who has been very kind in his consideration of this matter, and very cooperative in his interest as to what is best for the program, that I earnestly hope the bill can be sent back to conference. This is the only provision in the appropriation bill with which I have any quarrel at this time. I think it is so vital that it ought to be sent back, with firm determination on the part of the Senate conferees to correct the proviso, either by eliminating it or by adding certain other provisions to it, so that it will permit the starting of the program, and then rely upon future appropriations for the money which may be required in the future. I earnestly hope—and I say this with all sincerity—that the Senate should send the bill back to conference, and that the House conferees should understand the vital necessity of more latitude in the beginning of this program in the interest of our national defense.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will take only a few minutes, because I desire a vote on the report, and I want the vote to come promptly.

Mr. President, I have been connected with the atomic-energy efforts from the beginning. The first plant was established in my State, at my request. The engineers found the place and put it there. I am tremendously interested in it. No man is more interested in the atomic-energy program than I am.

If we were to take the bill back to conference we would not get anywhere with it. The House has made up its mind about it. They are an equal party with us in matters of legislation. If we send it back it is not going to do any good, in my judgment. Let me read the language. It does not mean what Mr. Gordon Dean says it means. It does not mean what the distinguished and eloquent Senator from Iowa says it means. It does not mean what my good friend the Senator from Arizona thinks it

means. Let us look at the amendment. Nothing is said in it about a package project or any other kind of project. The word "project" is excluded from the proviso. I will try to read the amendment in such a way that everyone can understand that it will not hamper the Atomic Energy Commission in the least. If I thought it did I would not agree to it, because I want the project to go forward. Let us consider the language:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction—

Does it say anything about a project? Oh, no; the word "project" is not used. of any building—

The House said that at one time additional buildings were erected when the money was not available with which to build them. I do not know whether that is correct, but the House thought so. of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project—

Specific portion of a project. It does not mean the building of a great project costing a billion dollars or half a billion dollars. That is excluded from this proviso.

The word "project" means the entire project.

This provision refers only to a building, a utility, or some "other specific portion" of a project—

unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

The language is perfectly clear. There can be no doubt about it. Any lawyer who would put a different construction on it, should study law longer.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have great respect for the opinion of the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. But if the language is perfectly clear, why did the committee strike it out in the first instance?

Mr. McKELLAR. We did so in order to get some kind of bill to help this great project, this great development along. We tried in every way to form such language that there could be no opposition to it.

I never dreamed that a fight of this kind would be made at this late hour in the session. The House has already adopted the resolution of adjournment.

I do not know whether we can get a further conference with the House; and if we did, it would be a useless conference.

If this provision does have a different effect, it can easily be corrected. The President can call us back into session at any time, and no doubt he will do so if this provision does affect the program adversely. The President should do so, and I believe he will do so, if it affects the program adversely.

But I do not believe it will affect it a single particular.

Senators will notice from the hearings that when Mr. Dean was testifying, he was very much more concerned about

the amount of the appropriation than he was about the language of the proviso. The language of the proviso seems to be an afterthought.

Let us look at the practical proposition, Mr. President. It is now half past 11 at night, and we are debating a question of this kind, when we know the House will not change its position on this matter. Is there a Senator here who believes that we could get the House to change its position? If so, I should like to have him rise.

So what is the use of advocating an impractical proposition?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, Mr. President, I think the House may change its mind. I think the House ought to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; that is one Senator who takes that position.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So do I.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So do I.

Mr. MOODY. So do I.

Mr. MONRONEY. So do I.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; that makes five Senators who think that way. But those Senators are not on the committee of conference. I know that we do not have a chance to change this provision.

The Senate should do what the committee has recommended.

Mr. President, I call for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have listened not only with interest, but with alarm, to the discussion this evening about this section of the conference report on the appropriation bill.

Very frankly, Mr. President, there is doubt as to what these words mean. That doubt has been expressed by a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That doubt has been expressed by him in what I consider to be a statesmanlike presentation on this floor. I wish to commend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] for his statesmanship this evening.

That doubt has been expressed by resolution in the committee, and that doubt has been expressed by the Atomic Energy Commission, and that doubt has been expressed by well-meaning, patriotic, loyal Senators on this floor.

Mr. President, I wish to say very frankly that a doubt of this nature cannot be left unresolved. It is imperative that Congress remain in session until we are perfectly clear what the Atomic Energy program is going to be.

By the action which Congress already has taken, the Air Form program has been extended for 1 year, and the military program has been reduced by several billion dollars, and the foreign aid and military assistance and economic assistance budgets have been reduced.

Mr. President, we are playing with our security; we are playing with disaster.

I repeat what I said a few days ago on this floor; namely, there is no dove of peace cooing in Stalin's ear. He is rattling the saber. He is making trouble in Berlin. He is clearing out those in the satellite countries about whom he has any doubt. He is causing riots in Japan.

There is trouble brewing, and the Congress cannot close its eyes to it.

I will never vote for this conference report until this body removes any doubt whatsoever from that language.

It is not important that the Senate adjourn tonight.

It is important that this atomic energy program go on.

I know nothing about the mysteries of that program, and I seek no knowledge of that sort. All I know is that surely the members of the Appropriations Committee do not have as much information on this matter as do the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Minnesota that we have more. So he can forget that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not yield.

I wish to say that throughout the years the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the members of the Atomic Energy Commission have made this matter their business.

It is wrong to say that the language is clear, because it is not clear to the Senator from Michigan or to the Senator from Illinois or to the Senator from Iowa or to the Senator from Oklahoma or to me.

This is the most serious issue which has been before this body. We are talking about atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs, and about the survival of our Nation and of the world.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not yield at this moment.

Until the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and until the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—unfortunately, he is absent tonight—tell me that this language is all right, the Senate will not leave this Chamber for a long time, because I have the floor. Let us make up our minds about that right now.

Mr. President, this language is not clear.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to make a statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield for the moment, Mr. President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield just for a statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator to wait just a moment, please.

Mr. President, I have all the affection and all the respect in the world for the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee. My words are not a reflection upon their integrity or their honor or their ability or their experience or their intelligence. They are more experienced than I am; they are more capable. Surely they have much more knowledge than I do of the workings of this body.

But, Mr. President, let me say in all candor and in all frankness that I think it is our job to resolve this issue.

The House of Representatives has sent back one conference report after

another. The House of Representatives wrote into these appropriations bills rider after rider.

The situation is such, for instance, that my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who is chairman of that committee, of which I am a member, was told—or at least they tried to tell him—that his bill could not be passed.

Mr. President, there are two bodies of this Congress; the Congress has two branches, the Senate and the House of Representatives. We do not have to take the advice and the counsel of the other House all the time; the Congress is not a one-way street.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator from Minnesota know that to a very great extent the attitude prevails that in the case of appropriations, the Congress should be a one-body organization?

I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for what he is saying. Some day we are going to come to grips with this issue, and the Senate will insist upon accepting its proper share of the responsibility in connection with the expenditure of public funds.

I am not so experienced as are some of the other members of the Appropriations Committee; but I can say to you tonight, Mr. President, that this issue is becoming more and more and more pronounced. I know whereof I speak. I have seen horse trading, without regard to merit, in order to get a bill reported. So far as I am concerned, I am ceasing to be a party to it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to say to the Senator from Minnesota that he has spoken words I believe to be true. I think the Senate conferees did the best they could, and I am sure that the Atomic Energy Commission feels that way about it; otherwise, I would not say it. But I think appropriation bills have been swallowed in certain instances, through conference reports that have come to the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. And how hard the members of our Appropriation Committee have worked. I commend them, I honor them, and I sympathize with them, in view of the tremendous pressure under which they have worked. All I say, Mr. President, is that I do not think it right in this instance to ask those of us who are quite as concerned about the security of our country as are the members of the Appropriations Committee, to accept language or a proviso in this bill which I honestly do not believe meets the situation.

The Senator from Iowa convinced me beyond the shadow of a doubt as to what the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has in mind. I submit that we

place a great trust in that committee. Time after time, in the few years I have been here, I have sat here to listen silently as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have come before us to tell us some of the things that are going on. We do not know. We never get on the inside of these organizations. We must accept the word of someone. And whose word do we accept? We accept the word of the Chairman of the Commission. We accept the word of whom else? The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the word of the other members of the Joint Committee. Here are Members of the House and of the Senate, members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and if I understand correctly, the Joint Committee, composed of Members of the House and Members of the Senate, believe that there is a doubt as to the meaning of this language, they believe that it is restrictive, they believe that it does not represent prudent judgment in the terms of the security of our country.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is making a very splendid and convincing argument, but the situation, as I see it, is this—and after saying this, I intend to ask the Senator a question. There is a disagreement as to the language of this bill, which is most vital. It should be determined by the Congress. What we do here might make a difference as to whether some of our homes shall be bombed and the welfare of our Nation seriously affected. I do not say that some of the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee may not be correct, although they struck out the language in the first place. But the hour is late, and it seems to me that the entire Senate should understand this proposition now. It seems to me it would be better if we would not debate it any further. I do not mean that as a criticism of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I think we should vote on this proposition. I believe we have the votes to reject the conference report and send it back to conference. I believe that in that manner we shall come nearer to getting an agreement than in any other way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that I want to yield to the Senator from New Mexico, because he requested me to yield a moment ago; after which, I will yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the only point I wanted to make is that this is an appropriation bill. I know the Senator from Minnesota does not intend to create such an impression, but it would seem that the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Michigan feel that they are more patriotic and more interested in trying to save the country than is the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, Mr. President, no Member of this body is to be more honored than is the Senator from Ten-

nessee. I have spoken publicly again and again of his fine qualities, of his fine character, and of his attributes as a statesman.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely want to say that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has proved himself to be about the youngest one among us.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is true.

Mr. McFARLAND. He has worked longer hours and he has worked harder than anyone else. He stood before us to make a wonderful speech here preceding the last vote. I am proud of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has been kind enough to yield to me. The point I am trying to make is that I do not want any Member of this body to feel that he is more patriotic, more loyal, or more earnestly seeking to protect the country than is the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. MAYBANK. No one is ever more patriotic or loyal than he.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask the Senator from Iowa a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I desire to ask the Senator from Iowa a question. He has just made an extremely fine explanation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am told that one building planned by the Atomic Energy Commission—I am informed that this information is not classified, and that it is therefore proper for me to mention it—I am told that one building planned by the Atomic Energy Commission will cost about \$1,000,000,000 of the \$1,450,000,000 appropriated. I should then like to ask the Senator whether, if the Commission were to start this one building and were to tie up \$1,000,000,000, it would be possible for the Commission then to start the remaining \$2,500,000,000 worth of projects which, as I understand, must be completed simultaneously, and therefore presumably must be started simultaneously.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall ask the Senator to pardon me if I do not give him a completely concise answer, for I am not certain about the classification of figures. I am not certain whether the Senator's figures are correct. I cannot say that the Senator is completely accurate in his illustration of the point, and whether it should be \$1,000,000,000, or \$1,250,000,000, or \$1,500,000,000 or \$500,000. He is illustrating a point. There are several operations in this program that cost very substantial amounts of money to complete. If the Atomic Energy Commission were compelled to have the money necessary to complete these most expensive programs in its

hands the result would be that the projects would only be built piecemeal. The Senator is illustrating the point.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as long as I am answering the question of the Senator from Illinois, I may say that I earnestly hope that no one, by the slightest imagination, thought that I was in any way impugning the patriotism of the Senator from Tennessee, who is one of the most patriotic men we have ever had in the United States Senate. I grant that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a resolution of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, adopted June 27, 1952.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, JUNE 27, 1952

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy met this morning and considered with the Atomic Energy Commission the proviso beginning on page 12, line 6, in the supplemental appropriations bill now pending before the House. It is clear that if this proviso becomes law, the Atomic Energy Commission will not be able to meet military requirements for atomic weapons as laid down by the President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The joint committee has unanimously requested that the House and Senate give consideration to deleting the proviso in question. In effect, as the proviso stands, the Commission cannot start on the programs necessary to meet military requirements because the funds requested of the Congress were cut in half and because the proviso provides that no building project may be started unless funds are available to complete it.

The joint committee has studied this program over an extended period of time and believes that the rider will prevent this program from going forward as national security requires.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for a division.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A division is requested. Those favoring the conference report will rise, and will remain standing until counted. Those opposed will rise, and will remain standing until counted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Chair is in the process of counting the vote. The vote is a tie, and the conference report is not agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8370, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 5, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 30, 53, 63, and 64 to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental

appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike the word "additional" in line 4 of said amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: After the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"For an additional amount for inquiries and investigations, Committee on Appropriations, \$250,000.

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, studies, and examination of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Committee on Appropriations Resolution No. 11, adopted by the committee on July 2, 1952, \$250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

"For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of Public Law 448, approved July 3, 1952, authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive use, \$125,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FOREIGN COUNTRIES

"For establishment and development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries, \$140,000,000, to remain available until expended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and insert in addition thereto the following:

"Any appropriation available to the Department of Defense shall be available for mustering-out payments as authorized by law."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "including not to exceed \$186,900 for personal services for those persons in a publicity office of the Mutual Security Agency in the District of Columbia the major part of whose activities is the dissemination of information in the United States and for expenses incident to the dissemination of such information."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,743,026."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 32, 50, 67, and 87.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon the

amendments in disagreement and ask a further conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

ADDITIONAL MATTER PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, additional matter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Material prepared by him entitled "Truman Foreign Aid Program."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, July 5, 1952, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution providing that, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 423. An act for the relief of Orazio Balasso;

S. 1095. An act to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1454. An act for the relief of Walter Koelz;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Adele Frattini;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro;

S. 1707. An act for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.;

S. 1740. An act for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye;

S. 1741. An act for the relief of Samuel A. Wise;

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Shizu Hasegawa Crockett;

S. 1840. An act for the relief of Tsuneo Tanigawa, also known as David Lawrence Rogers;

S. 1876. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.;

S. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Connell;

S. 1999. An act relating to withholding, for State income-tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees;

S. 2125. An act for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfreid Bohm;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura;

S. 2311. An act for the relief of Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock;

S. 2393. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H.;

S. 2395. An act for the relief of Ioannis Dimitriou Cohills;

S. 2473. An act for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini;

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi);

S. 2573. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease;

S. 2577. An act for the relief of Mikio Abe;

S. 2657. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414), and the act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, Stat. 825);

S. 2733. An act for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson, Jr.;

S. 2968. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 3140. An act for the relief of Victor de la Bretoniere;

S. 3161. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment;

S. 3162. An act for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara;

S. 3248. An act for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo;

S. 3280. An act for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar;

S. 3333. An act to vest title in the United States to certain lands and interests in lands of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation and to provide compensation therefor, and for other purposes; and

S. 3356. An act for the relief of Homer O. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings for today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send forward a conference report—

The VICE PRESIDENT. We have not yet acted on the last one.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am going to object to the conference report on civil functions appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not a question of objection. It is a question of agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to discuss the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I intend to discuss the report at length.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in order that he may move to bring up another conference report. I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside to take up another conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand my colleague from South Carolina and other Senators are prepared to speak at some length. We are not going to be persecuted in this manner in the Carolinas and in the Southeast. I want to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No civil functions appropriation bill will be passed tonight, so I shall start to read, Mr. President, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, July 4:

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, the strength of our years and the light of all our days, we turn again from the clash and clamor of our times, from the confusion of voices—

The confusion of voices, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. To what does the Senator object?

Mr. MAYBANK. Every member of the South Carolina delegation in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, every member of the Georgia delegation, and every Member of Congress from the Southeast resents the action of the conferees in connection with the Hartwell Dam.

Mr. McKELLAR. No one was any more strongly in favor of the Hartwell Dam than I. The conference committee was in session for hours.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senate will be in session for hours—until Monday morning if necessary.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee would withdraw this conference report temporarily.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should be glad to have that done; but there will not be any civil functions appropriation bill passed tonight without the money for Hartwell Dam. I shall read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am still a young man and quite able to stand here for some time. I shall read the entire RECORD.

I do not intend to have the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee run the Congress of the United States.

I do not intend to let my dear devoted friend, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee [Mr. McKELLAR], have this item kicked out. It is a direct slap at the delegations from South Carolina and Georgia and particularly at the junior senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that this conference report be withdrawn temporarily until the Senate can get action—

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that the distinguished majority leader has been on our side in this fight, along with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I will withdraw my objection with the understanding that the civil functions conference report will never be agreed to until I am heard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A conference report is a privileged matter and can be brought up at any time.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report? The Chair hears none and the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

THE NATICK LABORATORY—PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF THE QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had intended to make a statement regarding the inclusion of the Natick Laboratory in an earlier conference report presented

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses worked in all-night session.

Senate cleared Defense, legislative, and State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bills for President, adopted numerous other conference reports, but asked for further conferences on supplemental and civil-functions appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 9586-9792

Bills Introduced: 6 bills and 4 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3489 to S. 3494; S. J. Res. 171; and S. Res. 350 through S. Res. 352. *Pages 9588, 9591, 9663, 9669*

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 6007, to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in H. Doc. 143, 82d Congress, 1st session (S. Rept. 2118);

H. R. 6812, to provide that the existing project for navigation on the Guadalupe River, Texas, be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (S. Rept. 2119);

H. R. 5954, providing for release to Camden, N. J., of certain land, and easements to California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif. (S. Rept. 2120); and

H. R. 7126, conveyance of certain land and easements to California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif. (S. Rept. 2121); *Page 9587*

Armed Forces Voting: S. Res. 349, requesting governors of States to take action to afford members of Armed Forces the right to vote, was adopted after the title was amended. *Page 9609*

Natural Gas: S. 1084, to amend the Natural Gas Act, was passed with committee amendments, after rejection, by 21 yeas to 52 nays, of Douglas amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill. *Pages 9610-9617*

Railroad Agreements: Senate cleared for President S. 3161, to amend Interstate Commerce Act, relating to filing of equipment trust agreements on railroad equipment, after concurring in House amendments thereto. *Page 9561*

State, Justice, Commerce Appropriations: Conference report on H. R. 7289, State, Justice, Commerce appropriations for 1953, was adopted, and the bill was cleared for the President, after concurrence by Senate in House amendments to various Senate amendments. *Pages 9622-9625*

Military Public Works: Conference report on H. R. 8120, to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, was adopted, clearing bill for President. *Page 9622*

Civil Service Retirement: Conference report on S. 2968, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to increased annuities, was adopted, clearing bill for the President. *Page 9622*

Dedham, Maine, Land: Senate adopted conference report on H. R. 2190, to provide for conveyance to Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land in such town, clearing the bill for the President. *Page 9622*

Appropriation Bills: H. Con. Res. 239, authorizing Clerk of House to make corrections in general appropriations bills, was adopted. *Page 9622*

Defense Appropriations: Conference report on H. R. 7391, Defense appropriations for 1953, was adopted, and House amendments to numerous Senate amendments were accepted by the Senate. As to amendment No. 43, barring use of funds for any payment to ARO, Inc., for operation of Arnold Engineering and Development Center, Senate adopted O'Mahoney motion that Senate further insist upon this amendment and ask for a further conference, following rejection by 28 yeas to 33 nays of Kem motion that Senate recede from its amendment to this amendment No. 43. The original conferees were appointed to consider further amendment No. 43.

Following this second conference, Senate accepted modification of amendment No. 43 providing that no funds shall be used for payment to ARO after March 31, 1953, without congressional authorization. This action cleared the bill for the President. Pages 9634-9640

Bills Cleared for President: The following bills were passed without amendment, clearing them for the President:

Humboldt Bay, Calif.: H. R. 6007, to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in H. Doc. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session;

D. C. mail-equipment shops: H. R. 7471, to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail-equipment shops in Washington, D. C.;

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: H. R. 6812, to provide that the existing project for navigation on the Guadalupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway;

Pages 9659-9660, 9662-9663

Conference Reports Adopted: Senate adopted conference reports on the following bills:

Agricultural commodities: H. R. 8122, to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities;

Social Security: H. R. 7800, to amend the Social Security Act, increasing old-age and survivors' insurance benefits;

Excess Profits Tax: H. R. 8271, to amend the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 by adding thereto a new subsection relating to earnings deposits under Merchant Marine Act.

Pages 9640-9647

Unanimous-Consent Passages: By unanimous consent the following bills were passed:

Housing Act: H. R. 3177, to amend National Housing Act by providing that each officer or employee of any public unit having official custody of public funds and investing same in an insured institution shall be deemed an insured member in such custodial capacity;

Historical Society: H. R. 4792, to provide for the transfer of the Jeremiah Curtin home and underlying land to the Milwaukee County Historical Society by the Public Housing Administration;

Duluth-Superior Harbor: H. R. 8321, to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.;

Private Bill: H. R. 6558, a private bill;

Camden, N. J.: H. R. 5954, providing for release to Camden, N. J., of certain land and easements to California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.;

Richmond, Calif.: H. R. 7126, conveyance of certain land and easements to California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.

Pages 9631-9632, 9672-9673

Committee Assignment: Senator Connally was relieved from further service as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and Senator Johnson (Texas) was appointed to the vacancy thus created.

Page 9651

Internal Security: Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to submit and print reports during the adjourned period of the Eighty-second Congress.

Page 9652

Private Bills: Senate concurred in House amendment to H. R. 651, a private bill, clearing it for the President's signature.

Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of H. R. 6515, a private bill, and it was passed without amendment and cleared for the President.

Pages 9652, 9663

Water-Carrier Permits: House was requested to return to Senate S. 2634, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act relating to the revocation and amendment of water-carrier certificates and permits.

Page 9652

Legislative Appropriations: Senate adopted conference report on and cleared for President H. R. 7313, legislative appropriations for 1953, having accepted, on division vote, House amendment to Senate amendment No. 46 (expenses of Members of Congress and deduction for tax purposes of certain bad debts), and No. 53 (maintenance and operation of Senate Office Building).

Pages 9765-9774

Confirmations: Four civilian nominations were confirmed, along with 7 in the Public Health Service, 35 postmasters, and 5 Army nominations.

Page 9792

Nominations: Two civilian nominations were received, including that of Chester E. Stovall, of Missouri, to be member of Subversive Activities Control Board.

Page 9792

Supplemental Appropriations: Conference report on H. R. 8370, supplemental appropriations for 1953, was rejected, Senate asking for further conference on amendments in disagreement. (Action on this further conference was pending when this issue went to press.)

Pages 9774-9783

Army-Civil Functions Appropriations: Senate rejected conference report on H. R. 7268, Army-civil functions appropriations for 1953, Senate asking for further conference on amendment in disagreement. (Action on this conference was pending when this issue went to press.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COMMENDATION—SENATOR CONNALLY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee adopted unanimously a resolution of commendation for services rendered by Senator Connally, committee chairman.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 25 public bills, H. R. 8539-8563; 3 private bills, H. R. 8564-8566; and 5 resolutions, H. J. Res. 497, and H. Res. 742-745, were introduced. (This list is incomplete at the time this DIGEST is sent to press.)

Pages 9714, 9716, 9744, 9752, 9759-9760, 9762

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Conference report on H. R. 8120, to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations) (H. Rept. 2488);

Committee on Armed Services report on investigations (H. Rept. 2489);

Conference report on H. R. 8122, providing continuation of the dual parity formula and 90 percent of parity price supports until 1956 (H. Rept. 2490);

Conference report on H. R. 7800, to amend the Social Security Act, increasing old-age and survivors insurance benefits (H. Rept. 2491);

Conference report on H. R. 7313, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for fiscal year 1953 (H. Rept. 2492);

Conference report on H. R. 8271, to amend the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 by adding thereto a new subsection relating to earnings deposits under Merchant Marine Act (H. Rept. 2493);

Conference report on H. R. 8370, making appropriations to supply certain supplemental and deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 (H. Rept. 2494);

Conference report on H. R. 7391, Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1953 (H. Rept. 2495);

Conference report on H. R. 2190, to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way (H. Rept. 2496); and

Conference report on H. R. 7268, Civil functions, Department of the Army appropriation bill for 1953 (H. Rept. 2497).

Pages 9675-9676

Civil Service Retirement: Adopted conference report on S. 2968, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide a cost-of-living increase in Federal employee annuities, and sent the bill to the Senate. Pages 9752-9759

Military Public Works: Adopted conference report on H. R. 8120, to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and sent the measure to the Senate.

Pages 9676-9686

Agricultural Parity Prices: Representative Hoeven replaced Representative Hill as a conferee on H. R. 8122, to provide continuation of the dual parity formula and 90 percent of parity price supports until 1956.

Page 9687

Private Bill: Received a message from the Senate relative to its overriding the President's veto of S. 827, for the relief of Fred P. Hines, and transmitting the veto message. The bill and the veto message were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Page 9687

Cleared for the President: The following measures were cleared for Presidential action when the House agreed to Senate amendments thereto:

Post Office Quarters: H. R. 6839, to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes;

Columbia River Bridge: H. R. 2572, to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries;

Land transfer: H. R. 7317, authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.;

Pages 9686-9687

Unanimous-Consent Passages: The following bills were, by unanimous consent, called up, considered, and passed:

Indians: S. 3333, relating to interests in lands of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation;

Veterans—Psychosis: H. R. 5891, 2-year presumption for veterans developing the disease of psychosis;

Marion County, Ind.: H. R. 7262, to direct the Secretary of Interior to release all right, title, and interest of the U. S. in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind., with committee amendments;

Land exchange: H. R. 7555, relating to the exchange of land for purposes of the Colonial National Historical Park;

Klamath Indians: H. R. 3363, authorizes a depository for Klamath tribal loan funds, with committee amendments; and

South Dam: S. J. Res. 74, to change the name of the South Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dry Falls Dam.

Pages 9714, 9745-9746

Administrative Resolutions: Considered and adopted the following administrative resolution from the Committee on House Administration:

Architect's report: H. Res. 742, providing that the report of the Architect of the Capitol be printed as a House document;

Marvin Jones: H. Res. 743, providing for the printing of the proceedings of the presentation of the portrait of the Honorable Marvin Jones, to the Committee on Agriculture;

Committee investigation: H. Res. 733, providing \$20,000 for expenses of the study of the Committee on Banking and Currency authorized by H. Res. 436;

Inaugural addresses: H. Res. 726, providing for printing of inaugural addresses of all the Presidents as a House document;

Committee investigation: H. Res. 731, providing \$15,000 for expenses of the study of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, authorized by H. Res. 676; and

Contested elections: H. Res. 744, provides funds for compilation of data relative to contested election cases.

Pages 9714, 9716, 9744-9745

Defense Department Appropriations: Adopted the conference report on H. R. 7391, Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1953, and sent the bill to the Senate. The Senate voted to send the bill back to conference. The House further insisted upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 43, agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate, and appointed as conferees Representatives Mahon, Sheppard, Riley, Gore, Flood, Cannon, Taber, Wigglesworth, and Davis of Wisconsin.

The House subsequently adopted the conference report and again cleared the bill for the Senate.

Page 9751

Agriculture Parity Prices: Adopted conference report on H. R. 8122, providing continuation of the dual parity formula and 90 percent of parity price supports until 1956, thereby clearing the measure for the President.

Pages 9723-9724

Social Security: Adopted the conference report on H. R. 7800, to amend the Social Security Act, increasing old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, and sent the measure to the President.

Pages 9724-9735

Legislative Appropriation: Adopted the conference report on H. R. 7313, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for fiscal year 1953, and sent the measure to the Senate.

Pages 9737-9740

Excess Profits Tax Act: Adopted the conference report on H. R. 8271, amending Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 by adding thereto a new subsection relating to earnings deposits under Merchant Marine Act, thereby clearing the bill for Presidential action.

Pages 9740-9743

Supplemental Appropriation: Adopted conference report on H. R. 8370, making appropriations to supply certain supplemental and deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year 1953, and sent the bill to the Senate. The bill was sent back to conference by the Senate. The House disagreed to Senate amendments, agreed to a further conference, and appointed Representatives

Cannon, Mahon, Thomas, Whitten, Taber, Wigglesworth, and Davis of Wisconsin conferees; and subsequently adopted the conference report and again cleared the bill for the Senate. [Note.—The Senate had not acted on this conference report when this DIGEST went to press.]

Pages 9746-9750

Dedham, Maine: Adopted conference report on H. R. 2190, to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way, and sent the bill to the Senate.

Pages 9751-9752

Civil Functions Appropriation: Adopted conference report on H. R. 7268, civil functions, Department of the Army appropriation bill for 1953, and sent the bill to the Senate. The Senate voted to send the bill to a further conference. The House again disagreed to the Senate amendments, agreed to a further conference with the Senate, and appointed Representatives Cannon, Rabaut, McGrath, Gary, Taber, Davis of Wisconsin, and Ford conferees. The conference report was subsequently adopted by the House and the bill was again cleared for the Senate. [NOTE.—The Senate had not acted on this conference report when this DIGEST went to press.]

Pages 9752-9759

Legislative Program: Adopted H. Res. 745, providing for a committee to notify the President of the completion of all business before the House of Representatives. The committee consisted of Representatives McCormack and Halleck on the part of the House.

Page 9752

Adjournment Resolution: Adopted H. Con. Res. 240, providing for the sine die adjournment of the Eighty-second Congress on Saturday, July 5.

Pages 9759-9760

Enrolled Bills: Adopted H. Con. Res. 241, authorizing the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

Page 9760

GAO Reports: Adopted H. Res. 746, to authorize the printing as House documents of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress the reports made to Congress by the U. S. Comptroller General.

Page 9760

Documents and Papers: Adopted H. Res. 747, relative to the use of documents or papers under the control of and in the possession of the House of Representatives in court proceedings.

Page 9760

Adjournment: The House was in an all-night session and when this DIGEST went to press at 4:45 a. m. it had not concluded its business. The balance of the House action will appear in the next record.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

JULY 7, 1952.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8370]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment numbered 41 to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 41:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment to the Senate amendment insert the following:

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment", including the purchase (not to exceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$2,898,800,000: Provided, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding twenty-five years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project. The foregoing proviso

shall not be construed to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building or procurement of any machinery, equipment or materials therefor, nor any utility nor any portion or unit of a specific project if the funds are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such building, machinery, equipment or materials, or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion or unit of such project.

And the House agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
B. R. MAYBANK,
HOMER FERGUSON

(Per G. C.),

GUY CORDON,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

(Per G. C.),

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$2,898,800,000 instead of \$1,450,000,000 as proposed by the House, and a total authorization of \$3,518,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees request the Atomic Energy Commission to make an investigation at a cost of not to exceed \$250,000 in connection with the proposed Hartwell project in South Carolina and Georgia with a view to determining its importance to the development of atomic energy plants in that area, and to submit such report at the next session of Congress.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued July 8, 1952

For actions of July 6 & 7, 1952

82nd-2nd, No. 122

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7	Farm program.....5,15,29,34	Price support.....15,21,33
Appropriations.....1,2,8,35	Food.....14,30	Puerto Rico.....10
Congressional Record..31,40	Food-purchasing power....24	Reclamation.....9,26
Consolidation.....6,9	Foot-and-mouth disease	Reorganization.....27,29
Cotton.....16	laboratory.....42	Research.....11,42
Credit.....20	Fruits and vegetables.....6	Roads.....15
Dairy industry.....15,28	Furs.....38	St. Lawrence seaway..15,23
Economic report.....4	Grants in aid.....36	Sea water.....11
Electrification....15,25,37	Immigration.....19	Social security.....32
Emergency powers.....12	Irrigation.....11	Soil conservation.....15
Expenditures.....41	Labor, farm.....17,32	Taxation.....18
Extension work.....13	Labor, migratory.....3	Textiles.....16
Fair employment prac- tices.....22	Price control.....6,15	Water utilization.....39

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses completed congressional action on the Supplemental appropriation bill, and the Army-civil functions appropriation bill. Rep. Cooley defended administration's farm program. Both Houses adjourned sine die.

HOUSE AND SENATE - July 6

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 8370, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1953, but the Senate rejected a House provision regarding atomic-energy funds, and the bill was returned to conference (pp. 9794-805, 9831-4).

The Senate rejected the conference report on H. R. 7268, the Army civil functions appropriation bill, 1953, and conferees were appointed in both Houses for a further conference (pp. 9793-4, 9834).

SENATE - July 7

2. APPROPRIATIONS. Upon reconsideration, agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7268, the Army civil functions appropriation bill, after a provision had been inserted in H. R. 8370 for a study of the Hartwell Dam project (pp. 9814-24). This bill will now be sent to the President.
Both Houses agreed to a further conference report on H. R. 8370, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1953, regarding the AEC item (pp. 9813, 9843). This bill will now be sent to the President.
3. MIGRATORY LABOR. Sen. Humphrey inserted a letter from the National Council of Churches favoring S. 3300, to establish a Federal Commission on Migratory Labor (p. 9810).
4. ECONOMIC REPORT. Sen. O'Mahoney inserted a list of the publications of the Joint

Committee on the Economic Report (pp. 9825-6),

HOUSE - July 7

5. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Cooley defended the farm program and record of the present administration (pp. 9844-6).
6. PRICE CONTROL. Rep. McIntire gave his interpretation of the provision in H. R. 8210 prohibiting price ceilings on fresh or processed fruits or vegetables (p. 9841).
7. ADJOURNMENT. Both Houses adjourned sine die (pp. 9830, 9850). Unless the President calls a special session, the 82nd Congress will not meet again. Under the Constitution the 83rd Congress is scheduled to convene on Jan. 3, 1953.

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

8. APPROPRIATIONS. H. R. 7314, agricultural. Approved July 5 (Public Law 451, 82nd Cong.). At the end of this Digest is a detailed statement on this measure.
H. R. 7072, independent offices. Approved July 5 (Public Law 455, 82nd Cong.).
H. R. 7151, Labor-Federal Security. Approved July 5 (Public Law 452, 82nd Cong.).
H. R. 7216, D. C. Approved July 5 (Public Law 453, 82nd Cong.).
9. RECLAMATION. H. R. 2813, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Collbran reclamation project, Colo. Approved July 3, 1952 (Public Law 445, 82nd Cong.)
10. PUERTO RICO. H. J. Res. 430, to approve the constitution of Puerto Rico. Approved July 3, 1952 (Public Law 447, 82nd Cong.)
11. RESEARCH. H. R. 6578, to authorize the Interior Department, in cooperation with public and private agencies, to conduct research and demonstrations on the use of sea water for irrigation, etc. Approved July 3, 1952 (Public Law 448, 82nd Cong.)
12. EMERGENCY POWERS. H. J. Res. 477, to continue various war-time emergency powers. Approved July 5, 1952 (Public Law 450, 82nd Cong.)
13. EXTENSION WORK. H. R. 6773, to freeze extension-work allotments to States in accordance with the 1952 allotments (before the 1950 census figures were available). Approved July 7, 1952.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. FOOD. Sen. Holland inserted Mr. Millard Cass' speech made before the annual Florida State convention of Disabled American Veterans, "Food and Freedom" (pp. A4566-8).
15. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Wiley inserted his statement favoring the St. Lawrence seaway, more rural electrification, additional soil conservation, a sound farm parity program, and opposing foreign imports of dairy products, and synthetic dairy substitutes (pp. A4568-9).
Extension of remarks by Rep. Vursell supporting rural electrification, soil conservation, more farm-to-market roads, and opposing farm price controls, the



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 98

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 7, 1952

No. 122

Senate

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress will be published not later than Monday, August 18, 1952. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be placed in the hands of the Public Printer before that date, so as to insure their insertion in the permanent edition of the Record.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

[Continuation of Senate proceedings of
Saturday, July 5, 1952]

At 1 o'clock and 10 minutes a. m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Vice President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. GARY, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGLESWORTH, and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the

civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was rejected.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. THYE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the Hartwell Reservoir project. Naturally, I would be interested in it, because it is upon the Savannah River, between South Carolina and Georgia. It happens to be on a river where I lived as a boy. I know of the need for the Hartwell Dam. For that reason, I am prepared to make a lengthy address, not for

just a few minutes, not for just a few hours, but, if necessary, I am willing to speak the rest of this night and into tomorrow, because I am thoroughly convinced that the dam is needed as a defense measure. All the Army engineers who have looked into the project favor building the Hartwell Dam.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the project sponsored by the distinguished Senators from South Carolina is a worthy one. I am sure that those who favor it would prefer that we try to get the money rather than to talk about it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course, we want the dam to go forward.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand. That is the reason why we wanted to have a further conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in the conference report there is involved what I consider to be another very worthy project, namely, Ice Harbor Dam on the Snake River. The need for this dam is in the same category as is the dam of which the Senator from South Carolina has just spoken. The Ice Harbor Dam not only has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but also there has been submitted what is probably the most forceful letter I have ever seen addressed to Congress on the necessity for uninterrupted power for the great Hanford atomic energy plant.

Inasmuch as the report is to be returned for further conference, I sincerely hope that the House conferees will again consider the need for not only the Ice Harbor Dam, but also for the dam on the Savannah River, which involves practically the same conditions as does the dam in the State of Washington, to which I have just referred.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that both projects were approved by the Budget Bureau?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Both of them were. The Ice Harbor Dam has been included by the Senate in appropriation bills, not once, but three times. The Atomic Energy Commission is quite concerned about the whole matter, because of the need for a source of uninterrupted power.

er, not only at the Hanford project, but also at the great project now being built in Georgia and South Carolina.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, is the Senator from Washington informed about the great need for a new bridge over the lower Delaware River?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I am.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator believe that it is a worthy project?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I do. I voted for it.

Mr. FREAR. I understand that the Senator voted for it, and I wish to congratulate him upon doing so. I think that consideration should be given also to the proposed Delaware River Bridge in conjunction with the consideration to be given to the Hartwell Dam and the dam on the Snake River.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Delaware that I have been in Congress for a long time, although perhaps not so long as some other Senators now on the floor. Whenever there is pointed out to me a public works project constructed within the past 20 years that has become a so-called white elephant, I shall begin to scrutinize requests for public works projects, and vote against those I believe to be unworthy. All of the projects Senators have mentioned, so far as I know, not only are worth their keep, or worth the money that has been spent on them, but many projects are worth from 10 or 12 times the amount that has been spent on them, down to 3 or 4 times, or at least double, the amount that has been spent on them in the interest of the welfare of the country.

Mr. McFARLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington that his project also is a worthy one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not know what is contained in the conference report, but I might suggest to the majority leader that there was a provision for funds to conduct a flood survey in my section of the country, which was outmaneuvered in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. I would not like to return home and explain that we were outmaneuvered in the second session, after our seventh flood in 9 years. Of course, we do not expect to receive any flood control projects. Apparently we have not had enough floods to satisfy some people of the need for flood control.

However, we would like to have a few surveys made along the Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers, so that at least plans may be prepared for the future.

In the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, the Senate, I think by unanimous vote, strongly recommended that surveys be made, after the Senate Appropriations Committee had approved them following extensive hearings. But again the House of Representatives and the conference said, "No, there will be no survey funds." That may be the correct view in the opinion of the conferees, but it is not the view of the people who have suffered. My State has suffered hundreds of thousands of dollars in damage again this year, and suffered several millions of dollars in damage last year.

I have been told that some of the survey funds have been eliminated from the conference report. Funds were eliminated from the Interior appropriation bill for transmission lines after they had been recommended and voted for by the Senate in two other bills. Now they have been eliminated again. Where are the projects knocked out? Someone from the House of Representatives, in conference says, "No transmission lines." I suggest that the conference examine the bill carefully.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes a. m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 23 minutes a. m. the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Vice President.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the conferees are ready to report on the supplemental appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report must first come from the House before the Senate can take it up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suppose there is nothing for us to do until the report comes to the Senate, unless Senators would like to discuss it. They know what is contained in the report. Some Senators believe it is as unsatisfactory as the first report. We have not arrived at any agreement with respect to the Army civil functions conference report. It is beginning to look as though the Senate will have to recess until Monday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in all fairness to the Members of the Senate who are in the Chamber, I should say in advance of the receipt of the report that, based on the information I have with respect to the new agreement of the conferees on the supplemental appropriation bill, what is proposed with reference to atomic energy, from the standpoint of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the best interests of the atomic energy program, is utterly and completely unacceptable.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator that the conferees agreed that the difference between \$1,450,000,000 and \$2,000,000,000 is to be added.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; but as I said a short time ago when we were discussing the subject, the extra \$600,000,000 in my judgment, and I am sure in the opinion of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, means nothing, and adds nothing.

The \$1,400,000,000 is enough with which to start the program. Having

\$2,000,000,000 adds very little to it. The important point is the starting of the over-all program. The \$1,400,000,000 will apply on it, and the other money is to be appropriated next year and the year after.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that the \$1,450,000,000 will not only start the program, but it will complete the equivalent of one-half of the whole program? I make the statement because that is the statement which was made by the members of the Atomic Energy Commission before the committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is approximately 50 percent of the cost of the program.

Mr. CORDON. It is 50 percent of the cost of the program, but it represents a completed portion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am quite sure that that is not the view of the Atomic Energy Commission or of the joint committee.

Mr. CORDON. At the proper time I shall be very happy to read the record of what the members of the Atomic Energy Commission said.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have read the record of what the members of the committee said, namely, to the effect that the proviso would block the operation of the program. I have read that statement. The point is that the Atomic Energy program is not like building apartment units. The misconception that it is possible to build one unit and pay for it, and thus have an operating unit, is unfortunate.

It takes all the operating units to complete the operating program. I used the illustration of building a motor for an automobile and not building the transmission. There cannot be an automobile without the transmission or the wheels. It is like saying that \$3,000,000,000 are available with which to build a gasoline cracking plant, which takes crude oil and cracks it into gasoline for use in the operation of airplanes and automobiles. It is possible with that amount to build the central part of the plant, which costs three times as much as the two ends, but not the ends. However, when the central part of the plant is built it is still not possible to take crude oil into it and produce useful gasoline without the ends being constructed. It is necessary to complete the plant.

The program we are considering, involving two or three projects, is not quite so simple as that. I have rather oversimplified it. Two or three products are to be made under the new program; and in order to get the defensive weapons which this country must have against the time of need, in the shortest and most reasonable period of time, and with the greatest efficiency for the national defense, I am of the opinion, and so is the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that this program ought to be started in its entirety. It cannot be started in that way because the proviso says that all the money to pay for all the contracts must be provided before it can be started.

I say with all humility—and I hope my statement is taken in all verity—and with all due respect to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House, that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has been as unpolitical as any committee I have ever observed, and which is interested in the success of atomic energy and in the defense of this country, knows more about atomic energy than any group of people in the United States outside of the Atomic Energy Commission. We have lived with this subject since 1947.

I say, with humility and with respect for the Appropriations Committee, that honestly and truly we think we know more of what we are talking about in the atomic energy field than does any other group in the Congress. If we do not, the Congress made a mistake in creating the joint committee.

We have access repeatedly to daily reports, progress reports, scientific reports, and reports of great secrecy.

We know in the main what they propose to do 1 year from now, 2 years from now, 5 years from now. We know what they have done in the past 5 years, and we know it intimately and in detail.

Mr. President, I say to the Senate that when the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of 18 members, tell the Senate and tell the House of Representatives, without a dissent in the committee, that this proviso ought to be stricken out in the interest of the defense and the cumulative security of this country, within reasonable limits of time, I earnestly hope the Congress will accept their recommendations.

Again I cannot over-emphasize that I do not wish to criticize the Appropriations Committee. That committee is trying to save money; it is trying to do everything it can in that direction.

Normally there is no one who has voted for more limitations on the spending of money than I have.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for several questions?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the Senator from Iowa in a position to say that the Appropriations Committees have less knowledge than does the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy? I ask that question in all sincerity. We have to deal with a delicate problem.

Does the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have such information? Does the Senator from Iowa think the Appropriations Committee has less information, or does the Senator from Iowa think the Appropriations Committee acted with the same information the joint committee has?

I realize the delicate and strategic position in connection with the entire matter of national defense.

Has the Appropriations Committee acted upon the same information that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has, or is the Senator from Iowa able to say to this body that the 18 members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have information the public does not have and that the Appropriations

Committee does not have—information that the joint committee cannot release to us?

Must we rely, in the interest of national defense, upon the judgment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy because it has the advantage in possessing information and knowledge?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to answer the Senator from Arkansas as frankly and as fully as I can. Yes, the Appropriations Committee has less information than we have. In the main, I think the Appropriations Committees are given the major, overall, general information.

When I say the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has more information than do the Appropriations Committees, I say to the Senator from Arkansas that not a day goes by that progressive, developing information in the atomic program is not submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator from Iowa mean by that that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has more advance information than the Appropriations Committees are able to secure?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is a rather hard question to answer; I do not know what the Senator from Arkansas means by "advance information."

Mr. McCLELLAN. I mean information that has not been developed to the point where it is recognized that the information could be made available to the public and to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I suppose 80 percent of the information we get is classified in the very high secret brackets.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As one Member of the Senate, let me state what it is that I wish to know. I am not interested in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy or in the Appropriations Committees, as such; but I know that with world conditions as they are today, an armament race is going on—we had just as well admit it—for the most destructive power the ingenuity of man can create.

We have been ahead in certain fields. What I should like to have is the judgment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I should like to know whether that joint committee says that if this provision is put into the bill, it will simply mean that we shall be taking a desperate risk in the race for continued superiority in atomic weapons.

If I am convinced of that, I want to have this provision taken out of the bill. I think that is all we want to know. I think that is what all of us are seeking to know. We want to rely on our committee.

We are not asking the Senator from Iowa to divulge secrets which should not be divulged, but we want the absolute best judgment given to the Senate and to every Member of the Senate, namely, that when we follow the joint committee in this matter—even though all of us are interested in making economies—we are doing it in the interest of national defense, as an absolute necessity and to avoid unnecessary risk.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I can say "Yes" to the Senator from Arkansas, without qualification.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I wish to know. I think that is what every Senator wishes to know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that by eliminating this proviso, we shall arrive at a position of reliable security much quicker than we would otherwise. In other words, by including the proviso we would delay the program; and it might be too late, and it might cost us a great deal more money.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask another question: A little earlier tonight, the Senator from Iowa illustrated this point by saying that science is reaching out and is feeling its way and is moving; that it may move a bit in the wrong direction, then find that out and come back in the other direction; in other words, that experiment is being developed.

What I wish to be assured of is this: If we impose this restriction upon the Commission, will a handicap be placed upon them in that work?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Indeed, and a definite handicap in point of time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Could it be serious? Could it be fatal? Could it be so serious that it might be fatal?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It would be extremely serious from the point of view of our ability to assure our own defense. Whether it would be fatal, I could not say, because no one can say what would be fatal.

Mr. McCLELLAN. One other question: Suppose we include this provision in the bill. Can the Senator from Iowa assure me or can any other Member of the Senate assure me that it will ultimately save a dollar?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from Arkansas mean—

Mr. McCLELLAN. With the restriction left in the bill, will it ultimately save a dollar to the American taxpayers?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from Arkansas refer to what I advocate, or does he refer to what the conference committee advocates?

Mr. McCLELLAN. What the conference committee advocates: Will it ultimately save a dollar?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my judgment it will cost money. In my considered judgment and in the considered judgment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it will cost—well, I hate to give the Senator from Arkansas a figure, but it will cost several percentage points more—perhaps 10 or 15 percent more.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is important. All of us are under the stress of the effort to economize.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is what it will cost if we adopt the conference report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. All of us are under the stress of the effort to economize, but, of course, there can be false economy; we can practice false economy.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield on one point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator said "the conference committee." I think it should be made plain that it is not the conferees on the part of the Senate. The Senate struck out this proviso. The House conferees are the ones who are insisting on it.

So I think the blame should be placed where it belongs. The conferees on the part of the Senate have worked like troopers and have done the best they could. So let the House take the responsibility.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. I should like to comment upon what the majority leader said?

The majority leader is correct. The Senate has been favorable to the elimination of this provision. The Senate is on record, as I believe it should be, in the proper position. Unfortunately the House has been adamant in its purpose to include this proviso, and I must say that it stems from the policy established by the House a year or so ago against contract authority, and against writing contract authority into appropriation bills. Generally speaking, I am thoroughly in agreement with that policy. However, this happens to be an exception; and I am sure the Senator from Arizona knows that no Senator has voted more frequently to save money or to restrict bureaucratic agencies than have I.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is one of the reasons for my having listened so attentively to what the distinguished Senator from Iowa has had to say, because in my opinion he cannot be classified as an administration man.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Any similarity would be purely coincidental. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. It would probably be accidental, rather than coincidental.

Mr. President, I am not blaming the House conferees. I shall assume, and we must assume, that they are just as sincere as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not want it to be construed that I am casting any reflection upon them. But, Mr. President, we may be dealing with the destiny of this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. In a moment, if I may. So far as the Senator from Arizona is concerned, I may say that I would not be standing here at 15 minutes to 3 o'clock in the morning quarreling over words, did I not consider the situation to be serious.

I pay tribute to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], who, having studied this proposition, has, from his sick bed, written to us, pointing out the seriousness of the situation. He is drawing upon his diminished energy. I certainly hope he will be with us within the next week. I understand he is improving. Mr. President, I repeat that this matter is very serious; in fact, so serious that I would be willing for the

Senate to let the matter go over until Monday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Please do not say that.

Mr. McFARLAND. What are we to do? We have done our best. We have accomplished nothing. The House will not have a quorum, but we shall simply have to get a quorum. When it comes to dealing with what is best for the country, we are required to do many things. When the future of the Nation is involved, if it is necessary to call Senators back from the conventions, either the Democratic or the Republican Convention, it will have to be done. That is how serious it is. I am dependent upon the experts to make it unnecessary for us to do that.

Mr. President, we are dealing with the lives of the people of the United States, and with the possibility of the wiping out of cities. We should think twice. Possibly we should not be trying to do too much thinking at 15 minutes to 3 o'clock in the morning, but should go over until another day, and in the meantime do a little more thinking.

I thank the Senator from Iowa. I trust he will pardon the interruption.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the action of the distinguished Senator from Iowa in bringing up this question. Whenever, in the committee, I have had a chance to vote against the proviso I have done so. Any time I have had an opportunity to say a word against the proviso, which would delay the program 6 months, or that would delay the production of weapons for a year, I have done so. I am most grateful to the Senator from Iowa for having made this statement on the floor. He is better qualified to make such a statement than am I.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, as every Member on this floor knows, I am not concerned with advancing the political destinies of either the President of the United States or the Democratic Party.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am a Republican, and I shall do everything I can to advance the destinies of the Republican Party. Whatever Republican nominee is named at the convention, I shall do all I can to support him. But, above all, I am deeply concerned, as is the distinguished majority leader, with the security of the United States and with the most rapid advancement of that security within reasonable limits. The same may be said of the Senator from Arizona. We join in that concern as well, in mutual regard and personal friendship.

Mr. McFARLAND. And that is more important than either the Democratic or the Republican Party.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I say to you that I would not stand here myself at a quarter of 3 in the morning advancing this thought, merely to be talking or to be objecting to a conference report. I call attention to the fact

that several of us, including Representative DURHAM of the House, the vice chairman of the committee, who was on the floor a while ago, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and other Senators whom I see on the floor at this time, in fact, most of us have had something to do with the atomic-energy problems since the first special committee was created by the Senate of the United States to write the Atomic Energy Act. In some respects it has been our baby.

I have probably spoken out in criticism of what I considered to be waste in the atomic-energy program louder than any other individual. Whether I was right or wrong, I contend that within the past 4 years, the management of the Atomic Energy Commission has made substantial and material progress toward effecting the ultimate security of the United States. I do not want to see that march toward the reasonable, sound, and economic security of this country, beyond the possibility of any nation to defeat, destroyed by a mistaken idea of restrictions.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] requested that the provision now under discussion be stricken out. He is not here tonight, but I wanted to say that in justice to him. What the Senator from Iowa is saying is completely correct, as was the position of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Many Republicans and Democrats may be correct in regard to various incidental issues. But that is not the reason why Senators stand here at 3 o'clock in the morning on the day of adjournment to argue in this manner. There is no ulterior purpose on the part of anyone in regard to this subject. All that any of us is interested in is in providing the ultimate and most speedy defense of this country, and in assuring that it will have the greatest possible power. Let us not miss that.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been sitting here all evening, for 2 or 3 hours, listening to this debate, and to the expressions of different Senators as to the seriousness of the present situation. I say in all sincerity and in all fairness that Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, both in the Senate and in the House, have the votes to settle this matter and they could do it. It is their responsibility, because they control the Congress of the United States.

The able Senator from Iowa has on two occasions tonight explained his position. Now it is the Senate's responsibility. We stand here ready to cooperate. Why can we not get together? The Dem-

ocratic Members control this Congress. We should like to get the question settled. If Senators want to take a recess for 2 or 3 weeks, it is all right; but if we recess for 24 hours or for 2 weeks, it is not going to reconcile the difference. Senators are disagreeing among themselves. The Democratic Senators cannot point any fingers at any Republican either in the Senate or in the House, because the Democrats control the committees and the chairmanships. We stand ready to cooperate tonight. I beg Democratic Senators to put their house in order and use their own forces, because they control the funds and the chairmanships. The organization is in their hands tonight, and we stand ready to cooperate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I want to make a record of this matter, and I am sure the minority leader and the majority leader will join me.

The proviso which is obnoxious and which, in my judgment and in the unanimous judgment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and of the President of the United States, who saw fit to send a letter to the Senate this evening, reads as follows:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

That was the obnoxious provision, one which many of us would like to have stricken. After the conference report was rejected a couple of hours ago, some of us, including representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission, were asked to suggest language which might reconcile this obnoxious provision with a workable provision which would not slow down the program. So we got busy and submitted to the conferees this proposal:

Provided further, That this proviso shall not apply in cases where the President of the United States shall certify in writing to the Commission, to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House, and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that the commencement of immediate construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project is essential to the common defense and security.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offered that proviso, and the House conferees would not agree to it. Several of us tried our best to get them to agree, but, as I said before, they were adamant.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I complete the record, because I have read the two provisos in order that there may be a chronological record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as to what happened.

We submitted this as an additional proviso with which we believed the Atomic Energy Commission could live and start the project with some security. Here is what the conferees came back with—and I am not speaking critically of the Senate conferees—

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the

construction of any office building, residence, warehouse, or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building, or the procurement of any machinery, equipment, or materials therefor, or any utility or any portion of a unit of a specific project if the funds—

And this is the "stinger," and it is the same one that was in the original proviso—

if the funds are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such buildings, machinery, equipment, or materials or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion of a unit of any such project.

It was more restrictive when it came back from the conference than it was when we first dealt with it, and it is utterly unacceptable and unworkable.

I shall not take any more time of the Senate. I do not know any way in which I can adequately express my feeling as to the seriousness of this situation and the unworkability of this proviso. I know that the Members of the House are just as patriotically interested in strengthening the Nation as are the Members of the Senate. I think their attitude is due to a misconception of what we have to do in an atomic-energy program in order to get out of the spigot at the end the things necessary to save the country.

Mr. President, I said earlier this evening that it is a pioneering proposition. The House has been adamant that every building, every bit of equipment, and everything else must be designed starting the program. That cannot be done because it is not known what the end design is. The only sensible way in which the Atomic Energy Commission has been able to operate has been to design just ahead of construction. In the long run it probably saves money.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in reference to designing, the Senator will recall that the Senate passed a bill last night appropriating a billion dollars for military works on classified items. There was nothing further specified in the bill than \$1,000,000,000 for classified items. The money has now been appropriated. Is not that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand it is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. It is a fact. This bill carried \$1,400,000,000 for atomic energy projects. It is a reasonable inference that the bill, to which I just referred, which carries no proviso such as this has to do with air power and air bases connected with the possible missions on which the bombers might go.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. We are putting no limitation on the construction and making of bombs and turning the Air Force entirely loose. It seems to me that those facts themselves prove the inconsistency

of the position which has been taken elsewhere. If we can release funds for air bases without restriction we can certainly do the same in connection with atomic energy.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I again say to the Senate that no one gives more careful and meticulous attention to the expenditures of this Government or of the departments of the Government than I do. The Senate Appropriations Committee has been unusually meticulous. They are always careful and cautious. But several things have occurred. The President of the United States finally has become fearful, as he did today, about this proviso; the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on the 27th of June, approximately 2 weeks ago, was so concerned about the proviso that it unanimously adopted a resolution urging both Houses of Congress to eliminate it in the interest of the efficient development of the program; that committee unanimously says to Congress today, through its chairman and all of its members, that the proviso should be eliminated; the Atomic Energy Commission itself says it cannot live and does not dare operate under this proviso, because the General Accounting Office certainly will charge them with violating the restrictions of the law if they go ahead. I merely suggest those points to the Senate.

So far as I am concerned, if what I have said, and what other Senators have said, cannot convince the Senate, there are no words of mine and no actions of mine that can convince the Senate. I can only say that every Member of the Senate is as zealously interested in safeguarding the security of his Nation as I am. There is no difference in patriotism here.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wish to say, with regard to the statement of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] that the responsibility is on our side, that he cannot escape responsibility in that manner. This is a question which involves the entire United States.

I talked to the conferees, and the Republican conferees were just as adamant as the Democratic conferees. So we cannot escape the responsibility in that way. There is equal responsibility. If there is one thing that should call for equal responsibility, it is the security of the United States of America. We should not talk about politics or responsibility when it comes to a question such as this.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In a moment. I should like to say to the Senator from Arizona that we engaged in one political hassle 3 or 4 hours ago, and I am not going to engage in another one. The Senator and I are in full agreement as to responsibility. I desire to approach the subject completely relieved from any political implications, and I am sure the Senator from Arizona feels as I do.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I do. I am willing to take my share of the responsi-

bility, but I do not want any Senator to think that he cannot assume his responsibility as a Senator, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat. He cannot say that he may balance the vote one way or the other. He has got to vote. He has his responsibility. So we cannot always be talking politics.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I certainly agree with the able Senator from Arizona that it is a responsibility of all of us to look out for the best interests of the country. However, I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact, which he cannot deny, that the majority of the conferees on the part of the House are Democrats, and the majority of the conferees on the part of the Senate are likewise Democrats. The chairmen of the conferees of the respective Houses are Democrats. The Senator cannot escape that fact. If the Republicans as members of the conference of the House and in the Senate voted solidly, we still would not have a sufficient number of votes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will admit all that. I do not mean to inject politics into the debate. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that the majorities are so small that it will depend on the absentees in order to determine who is in the majority.

Mr. CAPEHART. A majority is a majority, regardless of how small or how large it is. The Senator cannot get away from that fact. I say the responsibility is on the Senator's side, and that he ought to accept it. I hope he will accept it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to take the responsibility if my good friend, the Senator from Indiana, does not wish to accept any responsibility in the matter. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I are willing to assume the responsibility and to let the Senator from Indiana out.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, that is typical of the way—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, that is typical of the way some persons do business. They completely avoid the facts. The facts are that the Democratic Party controls both Houses of Congress. It controls the chairmanships and controls the conferees who are in charge of the question being discussed tonight. The Senator's party could pass what it desires to pass and what the Senator advocates, because his party has the votes to do so. Why try to fool the people?

I hope the Senator will succeed in his purpose. I am with him. I shall vote with him. All I ask him to do is to get some action and to accept the responsibility. We are ready to vote whenever the Senator is.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is all very well, but when the Senator goes before Saint Peter, he will have to answer for his own sins, not for those of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CAPEHART. Thank God I shall not have to answer for the sins of the

able Senator from Arizona, for I shall have to answer for enough of my own.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have finished speaking. Nothing more I could say could add anything to what I have said, and I do not believe I should monopolize the time on the subject. I have attempted to say, as clearly as I could, what I believe, and earnestly believe, namely, that a vital part of the assured security of the United States is wrapped up in the speedy development of this program. Perhaps it could be delayed, yes; and if the Lord was with us, the delay might not be harmful. But under other conditions the delay might be fatal to the United States of America. I do not want to take that chance, especially when I believe that carrying out this program rapidly will cost less money than to string it out over a longer period of time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will yield to the Senator, or I will yield the floor. It makes no difference to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator yield so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We must be practical. We have learned that throughout our lives. When there are people of one view, and people of another view, it is necessary to try to resolve the different views, so that progress can be made. None of us can have his way about everything. I suppose everyone has had the same experience. I must cut my jacket to fit the cloth, constantly and continually. I have learned to live that way. If there are two viewpoints, and each of us is set in his own viewpoint, we are not going to get anywhere and it is idle to work longer on the matter. So what will the outcome be? Shall we destroy everything simply because we cannot have things as we would like to have them?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I will say to the Senator from Colorado. The outcome will be that the majority will determine the question. All I am trying to do is to make clear my position, the position of the members of the Joint Committee, and the position of the Atomic Energy Commission. The President has already made his position clear in a letter.

A majority in the Senate and in the House of Representatives will decide the issue. I must abide by that decision. I shall not mourn about it or go into a great silence about it. I will merely say, "I have made my record," but I shall be sorry if the decision goes against me. I repeat, I am merely trying to make my position clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that is fine. I believe that anyone who feels intensely about a matter should make his position clear and make the record clear. But it is not quite so simple as that. In theory, of course, the majority is going to decide the question, but that is not quite the way it is.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. By "majority" I did not mean a political party. I

meant that the numerical majority would decide it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I know the Senator did not refer to a political party. He means a majority of the Congress. In our present situation we cannot bring about a rule by majority in the Congress. The Senator knows that we are handicapped, and he knows the reasons why we are handicapped. He knows that we cannot do things in the normal way at this stage of the game. We have handicaps, and we must live within them. We must do the best we can within those handicaps. I think a person is taking a good deal of responsibility into his hands if he says, "Under these circumstances I will not play ball. I will quit. I will pick up my baseball mask and my baseball and my bat, and go home. I will not play the game any more."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator insinuate that I am saying that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I am not saying that the Senator is saying that, but I wonder where all this leads us. Where are we going?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will tell the Senator where it leads us. It leads to my making utterly clear what I believe to be the sound position which we should take in the interest of our national defense and security. When the majority of this body comes to a decision, I am through. I may disagree with the majority, but I am going to submit my case and my view, and the view of the joint committee of which the Senator is a member.

A few minutes ago I stated on the floor that the committee was 100 percent opposed to the proviso. I thought it was. The Senator from Colorado was not present at the meeting to which I referred. I do not know how he would have voted, but I do know that every proxy I had, and all the 13 members present, voted unanimously on this very important question. I am merely trying to make my position clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator from Colorado had been present at that meeting he would have voted just as the Senator from Iowa voted, because that is the ideal way of handling the situation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I want to yield the floor. I do not want to monopolize it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not want the Senator to yield the floor yet. I merely wish to reply to both the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Colorado. We have talked about responsibility. I have talked with the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON, and the ranking minority member, Mr. TABER. One was just as adamant on this question as the other.

That is not all. They were also adamant with respect to the civil-functions bill. I do not know how we on that bill stand, because there is a difference about it. I am not adamant on anything. I am willing to have the Senate take a vote.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President—

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to have a yea-and-nay vote now.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator does not, by any stretch of the imagination, interpret anything I have said as accusing any Democrat or Republican of choosing up sides on this question, does he?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I do not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not said that.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was putting the two leaders on the other side together.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think they are opposed to our view.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Arizona are together. I hope we are.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not think there is any politics involved in this question.

Mr. McFARLAND. We are not trying to force our views on anyone. The whole question is, What are we to do under the circumstances?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Iowa has taken a great deal of time tonight to explain to us for the second time the importance of the decision of this question. Very frankly, I was here, as was the Senator from Arizona, and other Senators were here, in 1949 when something happened which was world-shaking in its importance. Immediately after World War II our scientists predicted that the Soviet Union could not have the atom bomb before 1955. That was a conservative estimate. The simple fact, and the hard truth, is that in the month of September 1949 an atomic explosion took place in the Soviet Union. A year later a certain scientist who was on the inside of the major projects in this country, a man by the name of Klaus Fuchs, was captured as an atomic spy. The fact of the matter is that not only was he an atomic spy, but he also had critical materials, top-secret material, in reference to the hydrogen bomb.

This Congress made a terrible decision, a decision which made every man wonder whether or not we dared even think about it. At tremendous expense, we set up a plant designed to create the most monstrous instrument of destruction the world has ever known, the hydrogen bomb. There are scientists today who say that they do not want to go ahead with it because they do not know what may happen. I am sure that the Soviet Union is not moved by any moral scruples as to whether or not it ought to go ahead with it.

What is Congress doing? What are the conferees of the House of Representatives telling us? Let us face up to it. They are telling us that we should disregard the Atomic Energy Commission, composed of top-grade men, and Gordon Dean, a top-grade attorney, one of the great legal minds of this country, who surely can understand legislative history and the meaning of a proviso in a legislative enactment. He says

that this proviso should not be in the bill. The Commission says it should not be in the bill. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy says this proviso should not be in the bill. The President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, says that this proviso should not be in the bill.

When the Commander in Chief, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the United States Senate say the proviso should not be in the bill—when that much of ability, experience, and knowledge put together says that it ought not to be in the bill, I submit that the two Members of the House of Representatives, whoever they may be, who are trying to drive this provision into the bill, should not have their way. Even if we must stay here a long time to show them that they are not going to get their way, let us do it. They have no right to overrule the best brains of America, in terms of our defense. Is there any Senator who thinks he knows more about atomic energy and the security of the country than does the Atomic Energy Commission? I am sure that the Senate does not feel that way, and I hope no one in the House feels that way. I do not.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am willing to have a rising vote on this question, and to abide by the decision of the Senators present as to whether we shall approve the conference report or return it to conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, no.

Mr. McFARLAND. The House has asked for a conference on the civil-functions bill. I am willing to grant the request. If we send this report back, perhaps we can get what we should have. I hope we may have a rising vote on the question of whether or not to adopt the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report is not here. There is no way by which the Senate can vote on it at this time. It is not here.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we have heard from those who oppose the provision which I understand is now in the conference report. I believe that the Senate should hear from those who were in the conference and who know what took place as to what they believe the report means.

It is true that the Senate committee struck out this proviso. They felt that they should put in a provision for contract authority. We did the same thing in the defense bill in connection with the building of the 143 air wings. We were compelled in the conference to eliminate the contract authority. We put in the amount of money that was required to build the 143 air wings.

We have heard an explanation of the proviso. The members of the committee, including the chairman and other members of the conference committee, came to the floor of the Senate and explained what they believed to be the meaning of the proviso. Not one Senator on either side of the aisle disagreed as to what the proviso meant. It was our opinion that the construction of any particular building, any particular unit, or any par-

ticular part of a project or unit, for which the money was available could be started.

Mr. President, there are three projects. One is at a site not yet determined, with the plans not yet ready, which is a project with many buildings.

If the Appropriations Committee is not to have sufficient facts upon which to determine the amount of money to be appropriated we should take away from the Appropriations Committee the right to recommend appropriations for atomic energy and give it to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, if they are the only ones who have sufficient facts upon which to appropriate the taxpayers' dollars. There is not any doubt that that is what the Congress should do.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at this time. We are told here today that the Appropriations Committee cannot be given sufficient evidence upon which it can base an opinion in order to submit to the Senate their recommendation of what should be appropriated.

What is being asked for, Mr. President, is a blank check. We are being asked to give a blank check in an amount to be filled in by the Commission, with the advice of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

It is that procedure to which the House has objected. We can understand that there may arise some objections to giving a blank check, when it is believed that if the facts and circumstances were known it would not be necessary to give a blank check in order to permit the Atomic Energy Commission to start every building, every utility, and everything that they want within the next 6 months, when Congress will have returned. We know that we always receive urgency, deficiency, and supplemental appropriation bills immediately after the first day of January. We know that anything they desire could be taken care of.

I know that every member of the committee who spoke on the subject did so in good faith when he explained what was intended by the proviso. It is a well-known fact in law that if there is any ambiguity in a statute the legislative history in the Senate or House will aid in clearing up the ambiguity. I am satisfied that every member of the conference and every member of the Appropriations Committee felt that in the event the General Accounting Office were called upon to make an interpretation it would interpret the statute in the manner in which the committee interpreted the bill.

Mr. President, of course in the Appropriations Committee we do not receive daily reports as to how much is being manufactured, or as to how many bombs are being made, or anything of that nature, because we do not desire to have that information. But I see on the floor the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who has had a great deal of experience with the independent offices program and who has knowledge of the workings of the Atom-

ic Energy Commission and its building programs.

I also see on the floor the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is the chairman of the subcommittee handling the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I talked against the provision. I asked that it be stricken out. When it was not stricken out the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I talked with Mr. Boyer. He said it would wreck the Atomic Energy Commission. I am against the provision from first to last, because it will wreck the program of the Atomic Energy Commission. Not only that, but the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who discussed the matter with the Atomic Energy Commission, came to the committee and pleaded with it not to put the provision in the bill.

I will say to the Senate that the conferees did not put it in the bill. I have fought the provision since 10 o'clock this morning. I am not worried about any small thing. I am interested in America. I am worried about the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Boyer and Mr. Dean are against the provision. The President of the United States wrote a letter opposing it, and the letter has been read to the Senate. That is what I have in mind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. A good many of us who are not members of the Appropriations Committee or of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are very much concerned about the facts with respect to the application of the proviso. I should like to present a hypothetical case to the Senator from Michigan.

The Senator from Michigan knows me well enough to realize that I always put my cards on the table. Since the debate started I have been advised by a member of the staff of the Atomic Energy Commission that one of the things that is disturbing the members of that Commission is this situation: Suppose that under the bill they proceed with the building of a very important building. The most essential part of that building so far as the Atomic Energy Commission is concerned is the machinery which is to go into the building for very important scientific purposes. They advise me that the lead time which is required on much of that machinery is from 18 months to 2 years. They advised me that their legal staff interprets the proviso to have the effect—and it will be so interpreted when it reaches the General Accounting Office—that they will not be able to contract for the manufacture of the machinery which they will sorely need for atomic-energy purposes 18 months to 2 years from now, as long as the proviso stays in the bill.

I do not believe it is necessary to argue about facts. We should find out what the facts are and not argue about them. I am asking the Senator from

Michigan if he can tell the Senate whether the fears of the Atomic Energy Commission are well grounded. They say that the proviso which refers to buildings, utilities, and other portions of a project will apply to the machinery to be placed in the buildings.

If they are right, there is no doubt in the mind of the junior Senator from Oregon what ought to be done. We ought to have a quorum call and we ought to wait until the Sergeant at Arms takes a plane to Chicago and brings back some Senators in order to constitute a quorum, and then proceed to vote. This is a question affecting the national interest, Mr. President. If, on the other hand, the Atomic Energy Commission is wrong in their interpretation, and we can convince them that they are wrong, then the proviso, on the basis of the explanation which has been made by such distinguished Senators as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and others, can be allowed to stay in the bill, with the legislative history that has been made. But, if that is to be done, I must be satisfied that the facts are not as the Atomic Energy Commission is representing them to be.

Mr. FERGUSON. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that the item covers plant and equipment. There is not any doubt that the amount of money, which has been increased to \$2,000,000,000, covers both plant and equipment.

The new wording which has been placed in the limitation provides for just such a thing. If they could buy the equipment, they could order up to \$2,000,000,000 worth of plant and equipment. Within that limit, they could order any particular building or any particular part of a project or of a unit.

Therefore, as was said by the representative of the Commission, as appears on page 391 of the hearings:

The Commission feels that even though funds were appropriated in the amount requested, there would still be some question—

It is to be noted that the representative of the Commission did not say it would be absolutely certain—

under this provision as to the authority to proceed with the construction at the new site.

That is the site whose location has not been stated on the floor. I doubt that the Commission knows the exact site.

Mr. MORSE. We have not provided the funds for it, either.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, we are giving them \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. MORSE. But that is an amount short of what they will need to complete the project.

Mr. FERGUSON. They have said that they cannot use more than about \$600,000,000 in the next 6 months.

Mr. MORSE. But they can contract for machinery in excess of \$600,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true; but they say they do not know yet, and that they do not have plans and designs for the kind of machinery which may be required. They go from one day to the

next, fitting in a unit in relation to another unit they are setting up.

Mr. MORSE. Very well. If they do not know and if they cannot order the machinery, then what is the benefit of the proviso? If they are not going to do it anyway, why include the proviso?

Mr. FERGUSON. So they will come back to Congress.

Here is what they will spend in cash; I read from the hearings:

Senator SALTONSTALL. You do not intend to spend this \$3,000,000,000 in 1953?

Mr. DEAN. We do not. We expect actually to spend, in cash, something on the order of \$600,000,000.

That would be for the entire year 1953.

So the House was convinced. Each unit is not a unit of one building, but of many buildings. Anyone who has been at Oak Ridge or at Hanford realizes the number of buildings there. Even a town site is built, together with railroads, roads, hydroelectric plants or steam plants, and so forth.

Here is the answer, from Mr. Dean:

This figure that you have just given represents the cost of an entire complex at a new site.

Certainly it is a complicated proposition. Anything that costs \$1,000,000,000 or \$2,000,000,000 is a complex thing. But it comprises many units.

As the distinguished Senator from Iowa has said, the reason the plans and specifications cannot be made is that they themselves do not know what changes may be necessary. Science is moving from one day to the next.

Mr. MORSE. They cannot spend more money than Congress has appropriated. Then what good is the proviso? We have given them up to \$2,000,000,000, and that is as far as they can go anyway.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the proviso is not included, we shall have given them a blank check. They would not be satisfied—

Mr. MORSE. The figure is now up to \$2,000,000,000, and that is all they can spend until Congress meets again, at which time Congress can provide them with more money.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is right.

Mr. MORSE. But the question is whether with the proviso included, they will get into trouble with the General Accounting Office, because no matter what the legislative history may be, as it is made on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House of Representatives, the courts will apply the language that is written into the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think I can eliminate some of the difficulty upon this measure.

It is only necessary to refer to the amendment which was adopted by the Senate committee. That amendment was drafted largely by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. It had the complete agreement, we understood, of the Atomic Energy Commission. A reading of a few lines of this amendment demonstrates completely, it seems

to me, the futility of this entire argument.

I say to the Senate, Mr. President, in the first place, that the basic fact which is being neglected in this argument is that the money which was estimated for the continuation and expansion of the atomic energy program cannot possibly be expended during the fiscal year 1953. That is the basic fact, and it is proven by the Senate amendment which the Atomic Energy Commission was willing to accept.

I read it:

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "plant and equipment," \$1,450,000,000, of which \$1,355,398,000 is for (1) expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

In other words, by agreeing to this amendment, which the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the supplemental appropriation bill adopted, the Atomic Energy Commission was telling us in the plainest of plain words that all the money it could spend in 1953 was \$1,450,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Or contract for.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming read the next phrase?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed, I will:

Or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of \$3,518,800,000.

So here is a statement that even the \$4,450,000,000, although authorized to be expended during the fiscal year 1953, might not be expended during the fiscal year 1953, or else they would not have consented to the insertion of the words:

Or thereafter,—

After June 30, 1953—

under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of \$3,518,800,000 for the foregoing purposes.

Here the record is clear that the total contract authority which the Atomic Energy Commission wanted was \$3,518,800,000; that of that sum, not to exceed \$1,450,000,000 could be expended during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

So the question arises, What are we talking about? The second conference which was held agreed to increase this appropriation from \$1,450,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000. So the second conference was saying, "You may have \$2,000,000,000, and you may enter into contracts against it in any way you please; but we only put on the limitation"—which the House insisted upon, to clarify it—and I thank Mr. Scott, of our staff, for handing me the exact provision:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse, or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project.

With an appropriation of \$2,000,000,000, when the Atomic Energy Commission, through a staff member, tells a Member of this body that the machinery will not be ready for 12 months, in some

cases, how can it be said that the proviso constitutes a restriction? All in the world it amounts to, is a statement that the Congress of the United States is not issuing, as the Senator from Michigan has well said, a blank check to be spent, and authorizing contracts for any amount of money.

We are proud of the fact, and we have said it over and over again, that the Congress of the United States holds the purse string. I say to this body, Mr. President, that when the Congress of the United States transfers funds to an executive agency, without any strings, as was proposed in the substitute which was offered this evening by the Senator from Iowa, then, indeed, the Congress of the United States is surrendering the purse string. I say, without the slightest doubt in my own mind, that this supposed limitation is not a limitation. The whole difficulty has arisen out of the fact that spokesmen for the Atomic Energy Commission have been arguing against a construction which would open the door for them. They seek to close the door. Why? Because they want to have an unlimited demand upon the Treasury of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. GARY, Mr. TABER, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, and Mr. FORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Michiko Yamamori and her minor child; and

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dry Falls Dam.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of answering two questions?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. As usual, I find the explanations of the Senator very helpful. My first question is this: There is no doubt about the fact that they cannot possibly spend more, or contract for things involving expenditures in excess of the \$2,000,000,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct?

Mr. MORSE. Is it not also true that they cannot spend any part of that \$2,000,000,000 for any specific physical project that has not already been authorized?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They can spend it for the new project.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is aware of the new project?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am aware of the new project, certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Is it true that the new project has congressional approval?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding that it has.

Mr. MORSE. If the answers to my two questions are as I understand them to be, No. 1—

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I can answer that question, if the Senator would like to have me do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is a general blanket authorization in the original act, so an authorization for an appropriation is not necessary.

Mr. MORSE. We have projects that we may designate as projects X, Y, and Z.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They are all authorized, if appropriated for.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. We know of the projects X, Y, and Z, and we know that the maximum amount of money which is appropriated for X, Y, and Z happens to be \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Then why the proviso?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the members of the House Appropriations Committee were of the firm opinion that the Atomic Energy Commission should not have the liberty to contract for the expenditure of funds which could not possibly be spent within the fiscal year for which we were appropriating, without any supervision, let, or hindrance upon the part of the appropriating body.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It seems from the Senator's argument that, although, according to the RECORD, they could not possibly spend more than \$600,000,000, yet the committee has given them \$2,000,000,000. So that the argument seems to be somewhat fallacious.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, I said nothing about \$600,000,000.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood the Senator to indicate that they could

not spend more than \$600,000,000 in the year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then that must have been said by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I read that from the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But the committee now gives them \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason for that, clearly, is because we want to give them authority to make contracts in the future for that amount.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then I ask the Senator this question: Does the Appropriations Committee approach this project, as a \$3,500,000,000 project, or as a \$2,000,000,000 project? I may simply say that, obviously, if the Senate Appropriations Committee, or the House approaches it as a \$3,500,000,000 project, which I think it is, then there is no reason for stepping it down to only a partial starting of the program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator that, so far as I am concerned—and I think this is the view of the Appropriations Committee—it accepts the estimate made by the Atomic Energy Commission that the cost of this proposed project will not exceed \$3,518,800,000. That is for all four projects. I may say further to the Senator from Iowa that as a member of the Appropriations Committee, when I was chairman of the subcommittee on independent offices appropriations, before which the Atomic Energy Commission came—both in open session and in secret session—my experience with the Atomic Energy Commission was that its estimates are not firm, and that they overrun their estimates constantly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I agree thoroughly with the Senator. He has done a splendid job in times past in snubbing down their preliminary estimates. No one has been more critical than have I.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If a splendid job was done in snubbing them down in times past, what possible exception can there be now to a provision which gives them \$2,000,000,000, and which authorizes them to make contracts, when we know that the contracts cannot be fulfilled during fiscal 1953, and furthermore, when we know that a new Congress will take over in January, with ample power and ample authority to review any plans which the Atomic Energy Commission may have, and will provide the money? There is money enough in this bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If it were as simple as that, it would present no difficulty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the construction which the Senator ought to accept, I may say, and if the Senator accepts that construction, there is no one in the General Accounting Office who would deny it. But Senators would close the door in their own faces by construing this language as meaning that nothing can be done.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We do not. It is the construction of those who have intimately studied the subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are lawyers on the Appropriations Committee, too.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield once more to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I shall appreciate it if the Senator will bear with me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon. He has a very keen legal mind, and I am glad to have his questions.

Mr. MORSE. One more question. Let us assume a hypothetical question, namely, that the totality of this project can be described as units X, Y, and Z, for which, in this bill, there is appropriated \$2,000,000,000. Is the effect of the proviso to say to the Commission "You must complete project X; and you cannot go ahead now to let contracts for any item of any other units of project Y or project Z, whether it be for new machinery or for any other item, unless you can certify that you are completing project X, first. Then you can move to Y and then to Z?" If that be the effect does it not place the Atomic Energy Commission in such a position that it cannot let contracts in part for units X, Y, and Z, because units X, Y, and Z in their totality will require more than \$2,000,000,000?

So we say to them, in effect, by this proviso, "You cannot plan now for the lead time you are going to need, 2 to 3 years from now, for the full completion of X, Y, and Z because you cannot now certify that you have enough money to complete the three units, and you will have to confine your attention to the units for which you have enough money to complete within the \$2,000,000,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator would read the amendment again he would find that a project of this kind consists not of a single building—

Mr. MORSE. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It consists of a multiplicity of structures. It consists of machinery, equipment, and raw materials of various kinds. The money which is provided is ample to cover everything that can possibly be done during the fiscal year 1953 and is ample to cover contracts for the future, beyond 1953. All in the world that this amendment is saying is, "You shall not contract for more obligations against the Treasury of the United States to be expended 3, 4, or 5 years ahead, when you have full authority to spend \$550,000,000 more than you asked for in contract authority for 1953."

Mr. MORSE. I have just one more question. On the basis of that explanation, let us assume that the Atomic Energy Commission knows that in 1955 it is going to need a particularly complicated electrical machine, which will take 3 years to build, and which will cost \$500,000,000 upon completion. It is to be put into a unit which will be built in 1954, but the contract has to be let in September 1952. Can they make such a contract with this proviso in the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the first place, the Senator's hypothetical question is without foundation in fact.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know whether it is or not. It is a hypothetical question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], in explaining the totality of this project, told the Senate only a few hours ago, or sometime yesterday afternoon, that the atomic-energy program was an expanding program; that the Commission did not know from week to week or from month to month what it might turn out to be, so it is not able to plan for any type of machinery to be delivered in 1955. What the committee was trying to do was merely to say, "When you have your plans ready, come and get your money."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. When the atomic-energy program was first started, we had to place a little trust in it. If it had been attempted to run the program on a business basis it would not have gotten any place. I hope we can get a vote, whatever it may be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am ready to vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think my friend from Iowa will confirm the statement I am about to make. He advised me that my proposition is not hypothetical at all, that it is exactly the problem which confronts the Atomic Energy Commission; that the Commission does know of certain types of equipment it wants to order this year, and it will take considerable time to complete it. The Commission does not have a unit at this time in which they could place the equipment, because of the lead time they need in which to manufacture the item. What we are doing by this proviso is closing the door to them so that they cannot, when they find within the next few months that they need to order a piece of machinery to be placed in the unit 2 or 3 years from now, issue that order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can only say that from all the argument I have heard I am convinced beyond any shadow of doubt that the report of the conference committee on this matter will not impede in any way, shape, or form the development of the atomic-energy program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that the conference report has been messaged over, and the Chair would lay it down, but there is apparently a copy downstairs which will have to be brought to the Senate before that can be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what the proviso in its present form may well mean is this: The Government cannot start more than \$2,000,000,000 worth of projects, even though three and a half billion dollars' worth of projects are needed eventually to complete the new development. What good does this proviso do?

It obviously does not save any money, because the House conferees are willing to appropriate \$500,000,000 more than they were willing to appropriate a few hours ago. The proviso does not save money or reduce appropriations. All it may do is to reduce the scale of build-

ing, and apparently this is such a project that we have to take all of it or take nothing. We cannot reduce the scale. It has to be all or nothing. What good does the inclusion of the proviso do? It can do a great deal of harm.

Mr. President, I am informed that the House has not had a chance to vote as to whether it will uphold its conferees. I have great respect for the managers on the part of the House, but it is quite obvious that we are dealing with very stubborn men. It is not at all certain, however, that the House would vote to uphold its conferees if the matter could be presented to them. They may defeat the program by their stubbornness. I very much hope that we shall stand our ground and insist that this proviso be eliminated from the bill so that the project may go ahead.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is not a question of stubbornness. As I see it, it is a question of what is good for the United States of America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know the conferees are tired; I know they would like to get out of Washington; but, Mr. President, if a bomb were dropped and we did the wrong thing, they would be a great deal more tired and much more eager to get away. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Arizona is completely right. In justice to the House, I think we should give them another chance to repudiate their conference committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator had a distinguished record in World War II—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish the Senator from Arizona would not bring up that matter. Many privates who fought had far more distinguished records than I did, and received no praise.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator did not ask me to bring it up, but I say that he did have a distinguished record.

I wish to ask the Senator if this is not the one program that might save many deaths among the foot soldiers?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course; and it is also essential to the survival of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. In the long run, what is the most important program today for the defense of the United States? What will save us? What will save our fighting men? What is the big factor that is keeping war away today?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is well known that our atomic-energy power probably is the factor which, more than anything else, has deterred the Russians from attacking. It is quite obvious that the Russians are beginning to catch up with us. But apparently there is some mysterious development we have which the Russians, thank God, do not have at the moment, which can again give us atomic superiority. I believe it is necessary that we take it all in one piece and go

through with it. I do not believe that we can take it on the installment plan.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. What position will we be in—

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield momentarily, I wish to assure the Senator that we have atomic superiority today. I want no one to be deluded about that. The Russians undoubtedly are making progress, but all the talk to the effect that we have lost our superiority is not a fact.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. What will be our position if we do not go forward as we have in the past?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We must go forward in order to maintain increasing superiority. But I do not want the American people to be deluded by the statement of the Senator from Chicago that we are losing superiority in atomic energy.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think the Senator from Chicago intended his statement in that way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very proud to come from Chicago, but I also happen to be a Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Illinois yield so that the Chair may lay before the Senate a conference report?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report on House bill 8370, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 9831-9832 of House proceedings of today.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have the clerk ring the bell two times, without asking for a quorum, but merely to notify Senators in conference or who may be in cloakrooms that there will be a vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say only that I was on the conference, but I never signed the report. It will never be agreed to tonight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is whether the clerk will ring the bell twice. Without objection, the clerk will ring the bell twice.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think both sides are ready to vote on the conference report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, there cannot be a vote on the conference report until it is discussed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report that has been submitted does not include amendment 41. The amendment will have to be passed upon separately.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on amendment numbered 41. As to the rest of the conference report, there is no question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report would still have to be agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall not talk more than a few minutes. I merely wish to say that I feel in all seriousness that the second report of the conference committee should be agreed to. In the short time we had in which to act, I tried to get certain available factual data from the Atomic Energy Commission. I inquired particularly of Mr. Dean with reference to the major proposition, whether the money provided in the House bill could be used alone and of itself to extend or increase the production of the Atomic Energy Commission. The answer to my question was that it could be so used.

I then asked about the percentage increase of the \$1,450,000,000 in the bill as compared with the remainder of the bill, which would run about \$1,250,500,000. I may say that that was an inquiry made by the Committee on Appropriations of the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It should be understood that we must rely upon the executive office of the Government for our information.

The answer to the inquiry was that there was a definite percentage relationship. The chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission asked to go completely off the record with respect to his answers. There was not a scratch of a pen; nothing was taken down. It is not a case of a record having been made and then sequestered. No record was made.

I can only say that I could give percentages as they were presented to the committee. The percentage statement was then further illustrated with a chart which hung on the wall. The chart indicated the present production of fissionable material. It indicated in graduated steps the amount of fissionable material production as it would be increased year by year. At the top the chart indicated the additional amount of fissionable material that would be included if the full amount requested, which would be \$2,880,000,000, were appropriated.

We interrogated the chairman of the Commission with reference to the chart. I was particularly anxious to determine the answer to one question, namely, as to whether we were dealing in units? Or was each portion of the appropriation dependent upon another portion? If the latter were true, then there was no question left, so far as our committee could be concerned. It would be the full amount or nothing. But the answers were that if the money provided in the House bill could be used, it would represent a very definite appreciation in construction capacity.

There can be no question about the answer. There can be no question about each side understanding the other. With respect to the balance of the money which is here involved, we now have illustrated the percentage increase in fissionable material that would result from the expenditure of the other

fund. With that information at hand the committee took the steps indicated in the bill as reported. We struck out the proviso which the House put in, and we put in the equivalent of contract authority.

In the conference we were able to add to the \$1,450,000,000 the sum of \$550,000,000. Certainly the House is a co-equal body with the Senate; and I, for one, feel that it does a very good job of investigation because it has more time than we have. Members of the House Appropriations Committee serve on only one subcommittee, whereas our committee members serve on five subcommittees. The House took the view that it wanted to get as much of the atomic energy program up for competitive bidding as it could. The House Members felt that that should include all residential construction, all hospital construction, all school construction, and such things, all of which constitute a part of a new community which must be built for the new project. That category does not include additions to existing plants of the Commission, plants which by themselves represent complete operating units. As to the remainder, which is \$1,250,500,000, that will create a new community, with sanitary facilities, streets, and all the things which go into the making of a town. The House felt that in that field the Atomic Energy Commission could and should open the bidding to contractors and have competitive bidding so as to lower the cost. That was the basic argument in that field. Frankly, I say that I agree.

As to the expenditure of the funds, there is no question that the \$600,000,000 can all be expended in the next year. That is actually beside the point, because it is not a question of how many dollars are going to be spent within that period. It is a question of what can be done toward the creation of a completed productive unit. The Atomic Energy Commission could not begin construction of the entire unit, which would represent a completely new project, not an additional or expanded plant, but a completely new producing unit with a complete city around it.

The Commission cannot do any more than spend \$600,000,000 within the year. We got \$550,000,000, in addition to the \$1,450,000,000. We felt that under the circumstances it now being midyear, that money could be used for land acquisition. No determination has yet been made as to where the site is to be. The Commission has no options. It can obtain them and go ahead with such planning as is necessary to create such facilities as could be constructed by competitive bidding; and by the first of the year Congress will be in session and the remainder of the project can be taken up.

We are now working with a gun at our heads and with our brains practically numb. Under all the circumstances, I express the hope that we can approve this report and go on to the other matters at hand and get our job done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will explain the parliamentary situation.

When this report came over earlier it was one complete report, which the Senate rejected. It comes back now in two documents, consisting of a conference report, which apparently is not controversial, and the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 41, which is the subject of the controversy which has been in progress.

If the Senate adopts the conference report, it will vote separately on Senate amendment numbered 41; and if it adopts that, that ends it, the House having already adopted it. If it rejects amendment numbered 41, automatically the matter will have to go back to conference.

The question now is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to House bill 8370, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 6, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'Plant and equipment,' including the purchase (not to exceed an additional 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$2,000,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse, or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building or procurement of any machinery, equipment, or materials therefor, nor any utility nor any portion or unit of a specific project if the funds are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such building, machinery, equipment, or materials, or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion or unit of such project."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that this report, if anything, is more offensive than the original conference report. It comes back in a more un-understandable

hodgepodge of confusion and restriction.

I should like to mention one further matter which I had not intended to bring up because I did not want to confuse the main issue. The conferees have limited the settlement value in connection with contract termination to \$57,000,000 in this conference report, as they did in the other. If fate is with me, and I live until next January, I am sure I shall join with the other members of the joint committee in attempting to take out this utterly unworkable \$57,000,000 contract termination item.

It is necessary in this program for the Atomic Energy Commission to make contracts with public utilities, which will cause the installation or the acquisition of more than \$400,000,000 worth of equipment on the part of private investors and private utilities, in order to service most of these facilities. We hope that the contracts will run for 25 years and that there will be no termination damages. But if by some quirk of fate in this unknown field it should become necessary to terminate these contracts within 2 or 3 years, there would be far more than \$57,000,000 of termination costs on any kind of an equitable basis. But that is a matter which I think can go over until January. That is why I did not bring up the question. I merely wish to serve notice now that I think this is a nefarious conference report. I do not think it is sound, and I am against it for that reason.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment numbered 41, ask for a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I may say that the amendment which the Senate added to the bill was largely sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe it is an amendment which can be lived with very properly. I think it is a very excellent amendment, with the addition of the suggested reservation. I earnestly believe that if the Senate conferees will insist on the so-called Saltonstall suggestion and induce the House conferees to agree with them, the matter can be worked out satisfactorily.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator from Iowa be willing to accept the House language if the figure were to be

raised to \$3,580,000,000, which is the amount in the Saltonstall amendment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The amount of \$3,580,000,000 would, of course, solve the entire problem, but it would unnecessarily contribute to the Federal deficit. We do not need to appropriate that much money.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the amount were made \$3,580,000,000, with the proviso, does the Senator feel that it would not be restrictive and would allow the Atomic Energy Commission to go full steam ahead?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would be proprioration were made \$3,580,000,000. I reluctantly forced to accept it if the apstill say it is unnecessary and will increase the Federal deficit. There is no need to appropriate that much money. If that is the best we can do, that is the answer, I suppose.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would not increase the national debt until the amount was actually expended. So there would be nothing objectionable in that regard. It would amount to a larger appropriation, but it would not increased the national debt.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On the question of the national debt and the deficit, if the suggestion is satisfactory to the Senator from Michigan, I have enough respect for his guardianship of the national debt to go along with him.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

The Senate reassembled at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes a. m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I regret very much that we have had to keep the Senate in session for such a long time. I greatly appreciate the patience of the Members of the Senate and the hard work they have done in trying to arrive at an agreement, especially the conferees. Questions of great moment to our country are involved. Had it not been so we would have adjourned sine die and would have been in bed quite a long time ago. I think it is no more than proper that the Senate should recess until Monday and have time to think things over. I think we can determine the matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator proposing to recess now until Monday and transact business on Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think we should try to determine that now.

Mr. CAPEHART. We have got to determine it tonight. It is very unfair to those Senators who have left to attend the convention. A political party is having a national convention in Chicago. We all know that.

Mr. McFARLAND. It may very well be that the conferees will come in with a conference report by Monday, and we can then adjourn.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it possible to decide that tonight?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I cannot decide that question. The conferees will have to decide it. I do not know what they are going to do.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it was my understanding at the time of adjournment of the conference on the civil functions appropriation bill that the conferees of the House, Members of the minority party, were all leaving today, and the suggestion was made that the conference resume at 1 o'clock today, but that could not be done because they were all leaving. Therefore it was left, so far as the conference was concerned, that they could not get together again until after the week of the Republican Convention.

I should like to have that statement confirmed by the senior Senator from Arizona or by some other Senator who was present.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was no fixed time when the conference broke up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have known Members to change their minds.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator consider a unanimous consent agreement that the only business to be transacted on Monday will be the two conference reports?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the Senator's motion would be that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I would give the Senator assurance that we shall not transact any business on Monday other than the two conference reports.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Has the Senator considered the eventuality of no conference reports being available on Monday, and what action would then be taken?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not trying to take advantage of anyone. I have known Senators to change their minds.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator consider a unanimous-consent agreement that the only business to be transacted on Monday would be the consideration of the two conference reports?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; that is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the motion would be to recess until 12 o'clock Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I give the Senator assurance that we will not transact any business on Monday other than in connection with these two conference reports.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will there be day-by-day or 3-day recesses?

Mr. McFARLAND. We will determine that when we know whether the conferees are willing or unwilling to work.

Mr. CORDON. In any event, until such time as the Senators who have in good faith gone on the official business of their party can get back, there will be nothing but the two conference reports taken up, nothing else will be done?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Would that exclude a motion to adjourn sine die?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not making such a motion. If the conference reports are disposed of, we could then adjourn.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator about to suggest a recess until 12 o'clock on Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. With the understanding that the only business to be taken up at this session would be the two conference reports? No other business whatsoever would be taken up?

Mr. McFARLAND. What does the Senator mean by "this session"? I do not know what the Senate might decide to do later on, but I would say that on Monday—

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator plan to suggest a program for the time beyond Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know what the Senate might decide to do. I am not trying to take advantage of the minority. We will give the minority Senators an opportunity to return.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator understands that we have a special situation to be handled, which the Senator appreciates as well as we do. We know that he is not going to take advantage of the situation. But there is a question whether or not those who are here tonight, and have a very good purpose to be away on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, will understand what happened here tonight.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would it be possible to recess tonight until Monday noon, with the understanding that only the two conference reports would be taken up at this session of Congress, and after they were disposed of, the Senator would make a motion to adjourn sine die?

Mr. McFARLAND. I would not want to have that understanding. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that nothing will be taken up until the minority has had a chance to return.

Mr. CAPEHART. What does the Senator mean by "had a chance to return"? Why not recess until a week from Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. We cannot do that under the Constitution. Nothing will be taken up on Monday except the two conference reports. I am not trying to take advantage of anyone. But when the Senators return, I do not know what they might want to do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under a unanimous-consent agreement, we could agree to do anything.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We could not recess for more than 3 days.

Mr. MORSE. I think we can have a very simple understanding. Some of us will be in Chicago by tomorrow night. One of the first questions that will be asked us by our Senate colleagues is the kind of understanding which was arranged with the majority leader. I think it should be just this simple, that we recess from tonight until Monday, with the understanding that the only matters to be taken up on Monday would be the two conference reports, if they were ready.

Mr. McFARLAND. Or the only matters to be taken up during the Republican convention.

Mr. MORSE. That was to be my next point. If the reports are not ready on Monday, we can decide to recess until some other day during next week, with the understanding that the conference reports will be the only matters to be taken up. We can continue to recess during the next week until the Republican Senators are in a position, at the close of their convention, to return and transact business. I believe that is the only fair thing to do. If we can have that understanding with the majority leader, it is good enough for me, and I should think it would be good enough for everyone else.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I wish to say to my colleagues of the minority that under the circumstances I certainly have no objection to such procedure. I know of no other procedure that could be taken.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator knows that I would not try to take advantage of our colleagues.

Mr. CAPEHART. We understand that, too.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the members of the conference should change their minds, and we could adjourn sine die, I would suggest that we do so. But I give assurance that we will not take up anything else next week. Perhaps the Republican Convention will be concluded in 2 days.

Mr. CORDON. I am canceling my reservation. I shall remain here until the question is settled.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator would not have to do that.

Mr. CORDON. Or until we know there can be no conference report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have just one question. The Senator will limit the agreement to the conference reports, but does that mean that unanimous consent may not be obtained to make insertions in the RECORD? May we have that point clarified?

Mr. MORSE. Such permission has already been granted.

Mr. McFARLAND. I see no reason to deny Senators an opportunity to make insertions in the RECORD so long as no business, other than the conference reports, is transacted. I would agree to allow insertions to be made in the RECORD. Or if someone desired to speak, I think that would be all right. I do not know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator have any report at this particular moment as to what, if any, progress has been made on amendment 41 in the supplemental appropriations bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not.

Mr. CORDON. Perhaps I can help a little on that point. A statement was made—it was not official—that at the present time the feeling was that if the matter came before the House based on present views, there probably would be a request for a quorum, but a quorum could not be obtained. However, that situation can change overnight.

Mr. McFARLAND. Sometimes Senators change their minds, and if we could adjourn, it would be a wonderful thing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What are the present views of the Congress?

Mr. CORDON. They were not expressed. Nor were they asked for.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that I shall be here, and I will never change my mind.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for the next 30 days on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall miss the distinguished Senator from Indiana. I am sorry he will have to be absent, but I shall not object.

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate the Senator's compliment very much.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the fact that the Senator from Indiana has been granted a 30-day leave indicate that the Senate will continue its sessions for 30 days?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am going on an official mission for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the present request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I also ask leave to be absent from the Senate next week. I have reservations for departure for Chicago at 8:30 this morning. Although I have planned to go to Chicago, I am very much interested in the conference report, and I would dislike being in Chicago and then perhaps having to return on Monday. But I suppose there is nothing that can be done about it. I may send some long telegrams stating my position in the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. I want to be sure that I understand the agreement. The Senator from Arizona proposes a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow, and there might well be a recess then until Thursday. However, no business will be transacted other than the two conference reports, although Senators will be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. And no votes will be taken.

RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes a. m., Sunday, July 6, 1952) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Monday, July 7, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

(Continuation of House proceedings of
July 5, 1952)

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes a. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5954. An act to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city;

H. R. 6558. An act for the relief of George Blech and others; and

H. R. 7126. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill of the following title:

H. R. 651. An act to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419 for certain land in California.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7391) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7313) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," and that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 46 and 53.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;" be it further

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments Nos. 14, 32,

50, 57, 67, and 87 to the above-entitled bill; be it further

Resolved, That the Senate request a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments in disagreement.

Ordered, That Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, MAHON, THOMAS, WHITTEN, GARY, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to call.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 a. m. July 6, 1952.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The message announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953"; be it

Resolved, That the Senate further insist upon its amendments and requests a further conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. THYE to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 12, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 35, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 81, 82, 90 and 91.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 69, 70, 71, 74, 83, 85, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99 and 100, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines 2 and 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "to remain available until June 30, 1953,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum named insert "\$262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "fiscal year 1953,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and the sum proposed, insert the following: "\$88,094,000, of which \$50,000,000 shall be available only for the weapons program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$27,909,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,183,498"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$1,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,648,275"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$600,090,000" insert "\$585,510,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$386,409,840" insert "\$361,254,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the third line of the proposed amendment, after the word "programs" insert the following: ", other than those financed from funds contained in this chapter,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$28,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$60,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "Documents Numbered 144, 154 and 157"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: "Change the section number to 'SEC. 1411'."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1412" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1413"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1414"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1415"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1416"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 41.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 2: Inserts formal language in the bill.

Amendment No. 5: Strikes from the bill language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Strikes out an appropriation for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 7: Makes appropriation for airport claims as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IV

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$5,200,000 for operating expenses of Coast Guard as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$625,000 for retired pay, Coast Guard as proposed by the Senate instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the House.

Government corporation

Amendment No. 10: Provides \$15,000,000 for administrative expenses of Reconstruction Finance Corporation instead of \$14,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V

Federal Security Agency

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$60,000,000 for school construction as proposed by the Senate instead of \$80,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Restores formal language to the bill.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, and 15: Strike from the bill appropriations for pay act costs proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$69,750 for Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Strikes from the bill an appropriation for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$7,500 for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Strikes from the bill an appropriation for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 20, 21 & 22: Make appropriations for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, 25 & 26: Strike from the bill appropriations for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 27 & 28: Make appropriations for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$500,000 for hospitals and medical care as proposed by the House instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VII

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 31: Corrects a chapter number.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 33: Reinserts a House item for emergency repairs and replacement of buildings and utilities damaged by fire, storm, and flood. Appropriates \$262,500 instead of \$525,000 as proposed by the House. The funds made available are to be used for buildings and utilities only, and not for roads, parkways or trail construction.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$240,000 for further research and control activities in combatting the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes.

Amendment No. 35: Strikes out the amendment of the Senate to provide funds for construction of Minnesota transmission lines. The item has been stricken from the bill with the understanding that it will be given very careful consideration if it is proposed in the budget for 1954.

CHAPTER VIII

Independent offices

Amendment No. 36: Corrects a chapter number.

Executive Office of the President

Amendment No. 37—Alterations and repairs, Executive Mansion: Strikes out the provisions of the House providing \$50,000 for extraordinary alterations, repairs, and so forth, of the Executive Mansion and the White House Office, as proposed by the Senate.

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, and 40: Operating expenses: Appropriate \$88,094,000 for operating expenses, instead of \$35,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$141,188,000 as proposed by the Senate, and limits the amount available only for the weapons program to \$50,000,000, instead of \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House; limit funds available for expenses of program direction and administration personnel to \$27,909,900, instead of \$25,064,275 as proposed by the House and \$30,755,526 as proposed by the Senate; and limit funds available for expenses of travel to \$3,183,498, instead of \$2,709,350 as proposed by the House and \$3,657,647 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 42—Salaries and expenses: Provides \$125,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 43—Limitation on administrative expenses: Strikes out the provision of the House, and inserts the proposal of the Senate, in this connection.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 44—Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: Appropriates \$187,500 for such purpose, as proposed by the Senate.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriates \$150,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$85,000,000, as proposed by the House; and provide \$1,648,275 for expenses of travel, instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

War Claims Commission

Amendment No. 47—Administrative expenses: Appropriates \$250,000 for such purpose, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IX

Department of Defense

Title I—Military Public Works

Amendment No. 48: Corrects a chapter number.

Amendment No. 49—Inserts formal language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—Department of the Army: Appropriates \$585,510,000 for military construction, Army. The House had proposed a total of \$600,090,000. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill. The reduction of \$14,580,000 recommended below the House amount represents entire line item projects deleted in the conference agreement on the authorization bill, H. R. 8120, as compared with the House version of that bill.

Amendment No. 52—Department of the Navy: Appropriates \$361,254,840 for public

works, Navy. The House had proposed a total of \$386,409,840. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill. The net reduction of \$25,155,000 recommended below the House amount represents \$28,527,000 reduced by the conference agreement on H. R. 8120 as compared with the House version; and \$3,372,000 added as provided in H. R. 8120 for naval aviation training at Lincoln, Nebraska.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55—Department of the Air Force: Appropriate \$1,200,000,000 for acquisition and construction of real property, Air Force, as proposed by the House. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill.

Amendment No. 56: Restores the provision of the House restricting the use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts within the continental United States.

Amendment No. 58: Restores provisions of the House restricting the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery, laundry, or dry cleaning facilities, and prohibiting the establishment or maintenance of a separate supply service for the Air Force.

Amendment No. 59: Corrects a section number.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Alaska communication system

Amendment No. 60—Construction: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House earmarking \$5,000 for painting a specific building in Alaska.

CHAPTER X

Department of Defense

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XI

Mutual Security

Amendment No. 65: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Places a limitation on the number of persons employed at per diem rates as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 68: Includes explanatory language of the Senate with an amendment. The committee does not intend that the quantity of American agricultural products or commodities be reduced below that heretofore purchased because of this language.

Amendment No. 69: Strikes out language proposed by the House placing restrictions on employment of personnel.

CHAPTER XII

Emergencies agencies

Amendment No. 70: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates \$1,250,000 for Office of Defense Mobilization as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates \$2,875,000 for Defense Production Administration instead of \$2,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates \$3,750,000 for Small Defense Plants Administration instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Appropriates \$1,500,000 for revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates \$28,750,000 for Department of Commerce instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$32,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates \$3,100,000 for Department of the Interior instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Appropriates \$1,875,000 for Department of Labor instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates \$60,000,000 for Economic Stabilization Agency instead of \$57,130,000 as proposed by the House and \$75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 80: Appropriates \$6,500,000 for General Services Administration instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 81 and 82: Appropriate \$8,000,000 for the Federal Civil Defense Administration as proposed by the House instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates \$15,000,000, for Federal contributions as proposed by the Senate instead of \$29,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates \$20,000,000 for emergency supplies and equipment instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XIII—CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

Amendments Nos. 85 and 86: Inserts formal language in the bill.

CHAPTER XIV

General provisions

Amendments Nos. 88 and 89: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 90 and 91: Limit the amount which may be paid for automobiles by the Government to \$1,400 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 101: Restores language proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 102, 103, 104, 105, and 106: Correct section numbers.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TAHER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. THOMAS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 7, strike out:

"Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'Plant and equipment,' including the purchase (not to exceed an additional 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$1,450,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project."

And insert the following:

"Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'plant and equipment,' \$1,450,000,000, of which \$1,355,398,000 is for (i) expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of \$3,518,800,000 for the foregoing purposes which the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to enter into pursuant to the authority of this act as necessary or appropriate to carry out the program as recommended by the National Security Council, approved by the President of the United States, and submitted to the Congress by the Atomic Energy Commission and (ii) settlement and payment of termination claims under such contracts if additional appropriations to permit continuation of performance under such contracts are not hereafter made: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs as provided in the contracts, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, may be used, any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, to start new construction projects directly and primarily related to thermonuclear matters."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'Plant and equipment,' including the purchase (not to exceed an additional 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$2,000,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for pe-

riods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building or procurement of any machinery, equipment, or materials therefor, nor any utility nor any portion or unit of a specific project if the funds are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such building, machinery, equipment, or materials, or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion or unit of such project."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, briefly, what this does is to add about \$550,000,000 and explain the language in great detail. It is crystal clear.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions, administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, RABAUT, McGRATH, GARY, TABER, DAVIS of Wisconsin, and FORD.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to call.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes a. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. LANDERS, its clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amend-

ments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes"; be it further

Resolved, That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment numbered 41 and request a further conference in the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, MAHON, THOMAS, WHITTEN, GARY, TABER, WIGLESWORTH, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on the following Thursday and that when the House adjourns on Thursday next it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7289. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7656. An act to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7794. An act to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents"; and

H. R. 1180. An act to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 8, 1952
For actions of July 6 & 7, 1952
82nd-2nd, No. 122

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7	Farm program.....5,15,29,34	Price support.....15,21,33
Appropriations.....1,2,8,35	Food.....14,30	Puerto Rico.....10
Congressional Record..31,40	Food-purchasing power....24	Reclamation.....9,26
Consolidation.....6,9	Foot-and-mouth disease	Reorganization.....27,29
Cotton.....16	laboratory.....42	Research.....11,42
Credit.....20	Fruits and vegetables.....6	Roads.....15
Dairy industry.....15,28	Furs.....38	St. Lawrence seaway..15,23
Economic report.....4	Grants in aid.....36	Sea water.....11
Electrification....15,25,37	Immigration.....19	Social security.....32
Emergency powers.....12	Irrigation.....11	Soil conservation.....15
Expenditures.....41	Labor, farm.....17,32	Taxation.....18
Extension work.....13	Labor, migratory.....3	Textiles.....16
Fair employment prac- tices.....22	Price control.....6,15	Water utilization.....39

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses completed congressional action on the Supplemental appropriation bill, and the Army-civil functions appropriation bill. Rep. Cooley defended administration's farm program. Both Houses adjourned sine die.

HOUSE AND SENATE - July 6

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 8370, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1953, but the Senate rejected a House provision regarding atomic-energy funds, and the bill was returned to conference (pp. 9794-805, 9831-4).

The Senate rejected the conference report on H. R. 7268, the Army civil functions appropriation bill, 1953, and conferees were appointed in both Houses for a further conference (pp. 9793-4, 9834).

SENATE - July 7

2. APPROPRIATIONS. Upon reconsideration, agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7268, the Army civil functions appropriation bill, after a provision had been inserted in H. R. 8370 for a study of the Hartwell Dam project (pp. 9814-24). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Both Houses agreed to a further conference report on H. R. 8370, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1953, regarding the AEC item (pp. 9813, 9843). This bill will now be sent to the President.

3. MIGRATORY LABOR. Sen. Humphrey inserted a letter from the National Council of Churches favoring S. 3300, to establish a Federal Commission on Migratory Labor (p. 9810).

4. ECONOMIC REPORT. Sen. O'Mahoney inserted a list of the publications of the Joint

Committee on the Economic Report (pp. 9825-6).

HOUSE - July 7

5. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Cooley defended the farm program and record of the present administration (pp. 9844-6).
6. PRICE CONTROL. Rep. McIntire gave his interpretation of the provision in H. R. 8210 prohibiting price ceilings on fresh or processed fruits or vegetables (p. 9841).
7. ADJOURNMENT. Both Houses adjourned sine die (pp. 9830, 9850). Unless the President calls a special session, the 82nd Congress will not meet again. Under the Constitution the 83rd Congress is scheduled to convene on Jan. 3, 1953.

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

8. APPROPRIATIONS. H. R. 7314, agricultural. Approved July 5 (Public Law 451, 82nd Cong.). At the end of this Digest is a detailed statement on this measure.
H. R. 7072, independent offices. Approved July 5 (Public Law 455, 82nd Cong.).
H. R. 7151, Labor-Federal Security. Approved July 5 (Public Law 452, 82nd Cong.).
H. R. 7216, D. C. Approved July 5 (Public Law 453, 82nd Cong.).
9. RECLAMATION. H. R. 2813, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Collbran reclamation project, Colo. Approved July 3, 1952 (Public Law 445, 82nd Cong.)
10. PUERTO RICO. H. J. Res. 430, to approve the constitution of Puerto Rico. Approved July 3, 1952 (Public Law 447, 82nd Cong.)
11. RESEARCH. H. R. 6578, to authorize the Interior Department, in cooperation with public and private agencies, to conduct research and demonstrations on the use of sea water for irrigation, etc. Approved July 3, 1952 (Public Law 448, 82nd Cong.)
12. EMERGENCY POWERS. H. J. Res. 477, to continue various war-time emergency powers. Approved July 5, 1952 (Public Law 450, 82nd Cong.)
13. EXTENSION WORK. H. R. 6773, to freeze extension-work allotments to States in accordance with the 1952 allotments (before the 1950 census figures were available). Approved July 7, 1952.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. FOOD. Sen. Holland inserted Mr. Millard Cass' speech made before the annual Florida State convention of Disabled American Veterans, "Food and Freedom" (pp. A4566-8).
15. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Wiley inserted his statement favoring the St. Lawrence seaway, more rural electrification, additional soil conservation, a sound farm parity program, and opposing foreign imports of dairy products, and synthetic dairy substitutes (pp. A4568-9).

Extension of remarks by Rep. Vursell supporting rural electrification, soil conservation, more farm-to-market roads, and opposing farm price controls, the

H. R. 6558. An act for the relief of George Blech and others;

H. R. 6812. An act to provide that the existing project for a navigation channel on the Guadalupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway;

H. R. 6839. An act to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes;

H. R. 6845. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6856. An act to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act;

H. R. 6915. An act for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill;

H. R. 6945. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoffmann;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson;

H. R. 7095. An act for the relief of Ruth Ann Holecsek;

H. R. 7126. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 7202. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216);

H. R. 7204. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion," approved June 19, 1948;

H. R. 7241. An act to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam;

H. R. 7305. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah;

H. R. 7317. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.;

H. R. 7331. An act for the relief of Andrienne Lulz and John Lulz;

H. R. 7391. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7471. An act to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail equipment shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7645. An act for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto;

H. R. 7665. An act for the relief of Anahyn Earley;

H. R. 7721. An act to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial and relating to the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 7855. An act for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, New York;

H. R. 8052. An act for the relief of Ai-Ling Tung Tsou and her son, Moody Tsou;

H. R. 8120. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8122. An act to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8127. An act to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8170. An act relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 8190. An act to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington and Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River;

H. R. 8194. An act to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa;

H. R. 8234. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of supervisor of New York Harbor;

H. R. 8270. An act to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 8271. An act to amend sections 433 (b) 457, and 459 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8315. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8316. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8321. An act to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendment numbered 41 to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendment numbered 41 to the bill (H. R. 8370) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 41: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House

amendment numbered 41 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment to the Senate amendment, insert the following: "Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'plant and equipment,' including the purchase (not to exceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$2,898,800,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse, or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building or procurement of any machinery, equipment, or materials therefor, nor any utility nor any portion or unit of a specific project if the funds are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such building, machinery, equipment or materials, or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion or unit of such project."; and the House agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
B. R. MAYBANK,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on the conference report on the Atomic Energy Commission appropriations, I wish to compliment the members of the conference committee for what they have accomplished. It was the opinion of the Senate and of the junior Senator from Arizona that the rider which had been placed in the bill would have prevented the expenditure of even the \$600,000,000 which was contemplated to be spent in this fiscal year.

The only way to cure that situation and to enable the Commission to go forward with its program was either to strike out the rider, which provided that "no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project," or to appropriate the full amount needed for the construction.

I have before me a letter from Gordon Dean, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. The letter is addressed to me, and in it Mr. Dean states that if \$2,898,800,000 were appropriated, then the full program could be completed, although some of it will not be completed until 1953 or 1954; but that such an appropriation would permit the Commission to go forward, and therefore the rider would do no harm.

The Senate conferees were able to secure that compromise, if it can be called that. They are to be congratulated, because it removes any question, and now we can be assured that this program can go forward without being crippled.

Just one provision remains in the bill which possibly may give some trouble. I shall read another portion of the letter, and then I ask to have the entire letter printed in the body of the RECORD:

I expressed to you our concern as to the \$57,000,000 maximum cancellation costs for electric power which is now in the bill and which originated on the floor of the House.

I would be remiss if I did not make it clear to the conferees that this would prevent us from entering into the necessary power contracts at Oak Ridge, Paducah, and at the new site. We will, however, endeavor in some way to apply the \$57,000,000 among the various power contracts with the hope that we might induce the various utilities to commence construction of the necessary facilities. If we are successful in making adequate tentative contractual arrangements, and this I cannot guarantee, it would require that in the next session of the Congress we obtain legislation to increase the amount of the limitation in the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. It is altogether possible, is it not, to come forward with a supplemental appropriation at the beginning of the next session, without waiting to the end of the fiscal year, to correct that particular disability in the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that it would be far better if that provision were not in the bill. I know that it is necessary to eliminate the limitation if the Commission is going to enter into the contracts. But we can bring up this matter immediately after the first of the year, can we not?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is a conferee; and then I shall ask it of the chairman of the committee: It is my understanding that the Senate conferees feel that this provision does not prevent the Commission from making tentative arrangements and going forward, just so the liability incurred is not larger than the amount specified.

Mr. CORDON. There can be no question about that.

Mr. McFARLAND. This provision will permit the Commission to make tentative contracts, so long as the liability does not exceed the specified amount. Thereafter, as the Senator from Oregon has stated, the Congress can take any necessary further action immediately after the first of the year.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what is understood.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question, if the Senator from Arizona will yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand that the chairman of the Commission, Mr. Dean, specifically recommends the acceptance of this compromise?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall read the entire letter, for I know all Senators are interested in it.

JULY 7, 1952.

DEAR SENATOR McFARLAND: In response to your inquiry concerning the appropriation bill now pending in the Congress and covering an expansion of AEC facilities, I would make the following comments:

The proviso, under discussion, has always appeared to us to be a prohibition on starting with fiscal year 1953 funds construction of facilities, whatever their completion dates, for which funds are not available. As you know, the Commission could not, with the cut in appropriation coupled with the proviso, embark on the total program.

We have estimated that the total costs of those projects which must be started in the fiscal year 1953 to meet the presidentially approved program would be \$2,898,800,000. Consequently, should the proviso remain in the bill, we could proceed under a bill which appropriated such a sum.

Let me say that is what was done.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me, if he has finished?

Mr. McFARLAND. I was going to read the remainder of the letter.

Mr. MAYBANK. Very well; I shall wait.

Mr. McFARLAND. I read further from the letter:

I expressed to you our concern as to the \$57,000,000 maximum cancellation costs—

That is the part of the letter I read a moment ago.

Under the necessity, we have met this requirement. Since I have read the other portion of the letter, I may say that Mr. Dean states that the Commission will try to work it out, so that they will be able to go ahead.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely wish to compliment the conferees upon this arrangement. I was deeply concerned about the amount included in the original bill as it came to the Senate on Saturday night. I think I was not on the floor at the time. Had I been on the floor, I certainly would have voted to reject the conference report, which was done. I believe that any lessening of our efforts along the line of developing atomic weapons would be disastrous to the Nation. I am very glad indeed to know that this amendment has been accepted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr.

McKELLAR], as well as the other members of the committee. The majority leader has read a letter. I desire to make one comment, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to read a letter dated February 26, 1952, addressed to Lieut. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, National Military Establishment, by M. W. Boyer, General Manager of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. I understand that Mr. Boyer has a background of experience, coupled with integrity and honesty.

Mr. President, I may say that my reason for making the fight for the Hartwell Dam was because of the big hydrogen site on the Savannah. A site of more than 200,000 acres of land was procured in South Carolina. Also, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] so ably said earlier today, a site was approved in Oregon. I think the Savannah Valley was selected for one reason because of the plentiful supply of water. I am going to read the whole letter, but I read the following:

The Hartwell Dam will benefit the Savannah River project through the assurance of a uniform quantity of water supply and the reduction which we understand it will effect in the temperature of the water of the Savannah River which will be utilized at our Savannah River project. We also understand that it will contribute to the further reduction of flood hazards. Realization of these objectives will be of assistance to the operations at our Savannah River project. The lowering of the water temperatures will give some measure of increased efficiency in the operation of the reactors. The reduction of flood hazards will contribute to continuity of operations through avoidance of employee absenteeism resulting from real or potential flood threats.

Mr. President, I know what reactors are to be built. I have seen the secret documents about which the distinguished Senator from Iowa spoke Saturday night. In fighting for Hartwell Dam, I consider that I was fighting for America. And I was fighting for America because it is my country, the country I love. It was not because we wanted anything in South Carolina or Georgia, anything for ourselves in the way of flood-control legislation. We were confronted with the fact that the Savannah River project had to be constructed. We are now told that we cannot dam the Savannah River and bring about the desired reduction in the temperature of the river by 10 degrees. I am familiar with the proposed location of the reactors, upon which it is proposed to spend billions of dollars. I know where the funds are to be spent. I want to see an efficient operation.

As I understand, the conference committee agreed on an appropriation of \$2,898,800,000, instead of \$1,450,000,000, as proposed by the House, and a total authorization of \$3,518,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees request the Atomic Energy Commission to make an investigation at a cost of not to exceed \$250,000 in connection with the proposed Hartwell project in South Carolina and Georgia with a view to determining its importance to the develop-

ment of atomic energy plants in that area, and to submit such report at the next session of Congress.

I know that it will be impossible to provide necessary pots on the Savannah River, even though millions of dollars may be spent on the hydrogen plant, unless the waters are cooled and I know this will necessitate the construction of the Hartwell Dam. I regret that the provision has not been included in the Civil Functions bill. I regret that my colleague, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who knows so much about this matter, is absent. My friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], suggested to me that the Army engineers ought to make a report on this project as quickly as possible.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I see no reason in the world why, in view of the fact that the Corps of Engineers has substantially completed its investigation and has all the data, it has not yet compiled it in a final report.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORDON. It yet has some work to do, but I can see no reason why the report on that project should not be prepared, filed, and be placed before the Congress shortly after the first of the year, when certainly there is every reason for requesting a supplemental for the Hartwell Dam.

I may say that the basis of the objection of the House to the Hartwell project was the fact that the Corps of Engineers had not filed the basic project report, indicating to the House Members that the preliminary work, which gives the engineering knowledge in the field of topography and in the field of land classification, and so forth, was not available; that, therefore, any estimate of cost was too vague, and that the information necessary to start actual construction was not available. The Senate hearings indicate that the Army engineers have the information.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. But they had not compiled it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is again correct.

Mr. CORDON. That should be done, and certainly I hope we can entertain a supplemental estimate.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know that a delegation from Georgia and another delegation of Representatives from South Carolina came before the committee to testify on this matter. We know that, regardless of the money which may be spent on the atomic energy project, it is impossible to build the necessary pots unless a dam is built for the purpose of cooling the water. The reason for selecting the Savannah River was that the headwaters have their rise in the mountains, and Hartwell Dam would be the best place of adequate size in which to collect the water.

I was here on Saturday night and Sunday morning fighting for the Hartwell

Dam, as our distinguished chairman knows. I did not sign the conference report, proposing an authorization but without providing the money. But I signed it today. I was very happy to sign it. I congratulate the distinguished chairman. I hope the House will be able to work the matter out satisfactorily.

I want it distinctly understood that the people of South Carolina and Georgia in the vicinity of Augusta, Ga., and Aiken, S. C., are not desirous of having a large amount of fissionable material and secret material stored, near them unless it can be properly cared for. No other State of the union would ask their Senators to stand on the floor of the Senate to consent to such a thing. When the report is placed before us, stating the position of the Atomic Energy Commission, if I believe it is in furtherance of the defense of this Nation, I shall support it. If that is not the case, then I am going to insist that nothing be stored outside Augusta, Ga., or Aiken, S. C., of the sort I have described. I have nothing else to say.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire now to discuss the civil functions appropriation bill, which has just been mentioned. I think I have never been more disappointed in my life, that an amendment authorizing the Hartwell Dam has been rejected at this time. I do not know, and of course no one can tell until the votes are counted, but I believe I shall be reelected in the fall primaries. If I am reelected, I want to assure my good friend from South Carolina, who is one of the ablest members of the Appropriations Committee, that I shall again do what I have tried to do this time, but failed, namely, to include an ample appropriation for the dam at Hartwell.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am sure the Senator will be motivated by a consideration of national security.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. I am really deeply disappointed. I fought for the amendment in every way I could, but we were overruled—a thing which happens very frequently in connection with legislative matters.

Mr. President, I now want to move—and I shall yield to my friend from New Mexico in a moment—to discharge the Senate conferees from further consideration of the amendment in disagreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we were just talking about a dam in South Carolina. In the civil functions bill there are two projects of that kind, and they are on exactly all fours with the South Carolina project. If there is going to be any agreement on one, there should be an agreement on both.

I know the problem which confronted the chairman in the case of the Hartwell Dam and the Ice Harbor Dam. They

both involve the question of atomic energy and involve the same approach.

Before any conference report is adopted, I am going to say something to the Senate, because I have the strongest, most vigorous letter from the Atomic Energy Commission as to the necessity for both of these dams that I have ever seen written by any department. I may be overruled because of the fact that there are certain persons who seem to be adamant about this matter, but before we recede from the Senate amendment I want the people to understand and the RECORD to be very clear as to what we are doing. I say that in no derogation of the chairman of the committee or the Senate conference committee or the Members of the Senate who have fought to change the opinion of the House conferees. I want to preface my remarks with that statement, because the Senators from South Carolina and I appreciate what has been done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not so familiar with the Ice Harbor project as I am with the Hartwell project. I do not know why. Maybe it was because the Senator from Washington was not here at the time the committee considered the item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator must be familiar with it, because Ice Harbor has been in appropriation bills three times.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have always voted with the Senator not only for Ice Harbor but for every dam project in the country. [Laughter.] I want to tell the Senator why. Years ago, when we began the effort to provide for what is now known as the Tennessee Valley project, but which was then known as the Muscle Shoals project, it involved one of the first legislative fights in which I ever took part. The western Senators stood by us, and we were enabled, over the President's opposition at the time, or, at least, his halfway opposition, to secure the passage of the bill passed. He allowed his own commission which he had appointed to lobby against the Tennessee Valley Authority bill. Members of the commission were in the cloakrooms busy lobbying while the Senate was in session. But the western Senators stood by me, and the bill was passed, I think, by a majority of one vote, as to the first dam. Later the other dams were agreed to.

I am profoundly grateful to Senators from the great West for having helped me at that time. I made up my mind then that whenever it was humanly possible for me to help out the western Senators I would do so. Not only did the western Senators help, but the southern Senators and some of the northern Senators also helped. They were very kind and considerate. It was at a time when no one knew whether we could obtain electricity from water power at that point, but the bill was passed.

The Senator from Washington need have no fears about my support when his dam bill comes up. [Laughter.] I do not mean "d-a-m-n," I mean "d-a-m."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to discharge the Senate conferees.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.
Mr. President—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield, so that I may ask immediate consideration of an order?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read it.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That a committee of two Members of the Senate be appointed to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have listened to the discussion about the Hartwell project—

Mr. McFARLAND. This order does not have anything to do with that project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the purpose of the order. I have gone through several sessions. But I do not know whether we have completed our business. All the discussion has been with reference to one project.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have a very strong letter from the Atomic Energy Commission, setting forth that the Hanford project which now exists needs the water.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are on the same basis, exactly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the order submitted by the Senator from Arizona.

The order was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] as the Senate Members of the committee to notify the President of the United States of the completion of the business of the session.

HARTWELL DAM PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Tennessee make the statement that he will fight for the Hartwell Dam early in the next session.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that I said "If I am here."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know the Senator from Tennessee has been in favor of the Hartwell Dam in the past.

I want to commend the conferees of the Senate. I understand they have fought valiantly for the Hartwell project. It pains me to know that there are some Members of the House who are against almost all dams, so far as that is concerned. I do not know what we are going to accomplish next year with reference to them, but it is a game we can play in two ways. So far as I am

concerned, I am going to be back in January fighting for the Hartwell Dam. I almost have a good notion to keep the Senate here until tomorrow, I am so strong for it, because I believe deep down in my heart it is just as important as is sending billions of dollars across the water to other nations, in order that they may prepare and arm themselves, to assure the bomb plant at Aiken, S. C., of having sufficient water with which to carry on the activities there as they should be carried on. That is the position we are in.

Let us consider for a moment what we are facing. The Hartwell Dam site is some 40 miles or more from the mountains. The streams would feed into a holding reservoir their full waters, which would feed to the Clark Hill Dam, some 40 or 50 miles below, and the water would then go on downstream to the bomb plant, some 40 or 50 miles below.

Other Senators know as well as I do that there are seasons when water is plentiful, when it should be stored up, to be ready to be turned loose to go downstream when it is needed. That is what the proposed dam would make possible. It would enable the Clark Hill project to pay back money to the Government though the development of 15,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power, more than would be available if the dam were built below that site. I believe the dam would also pay for itself with interest, and at the same time would guarantee to the bomb plant all the water necessary to carry on its activities.

For that reason, I think we would be almost derelict in our duty if we put off until another year what we must acknowledge is necessary, or will be necessary in the near future.

I express my thanks to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. He has been favorable to all dam sites; there can be no question about that. He has worked diligently, and I am one who hopes he will be reelected. I do not stand back and not say so, for the people of Tennessee owe it to the Senator to reelect him because of what he has done for the people of Tennessee, if in no other respect, for what he has done in regard to TVA. I hope he will be returned to the Senate in the coming election.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in regard to these two dams, I know that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations did everything he could to get appropriations for both the Hartwell Dam and the Ice Harbor Dam. I know it, because I heard his conversations over the telephone. I myself went to Members of the House and made a plea for the dams. Everything that could be done has been done to obtain appropriations for the two dams, but funds for them could not be and cannot be obtained. The House was adamant in its opposition. The only thing we could do was to lay a foundation for action next January.

We have heard the distinguished chairman and other members of the Committee on Appropriations say that they are going to fight to include these

projects in a supplemental appropriation bill when one is next considered. These are not the only dams for which appropriations are needed. The Senator from West Virginia is interested in a project, and other Senators likewise are interested in several projects.

Senators could hold up the report and deadlock proceedings by talking for 2 or 3 days, but it would not do any good. The chairman and members of the Committee on Appropriations have done everything humanly possible to get appropriations for both these dams, and I honestly believe that sufficient foundation has been laid so that after the first of the year, when a deficiency bill is presented—and I have never known a time when one did not come from the House since I have been a Member of the Senate—while of course I cannot say with certainty, I am sure that both Senators from the great States of South Carolina, Georgia, and Washington, will have a good chance to obtain appropriations for their projects. I think they will have a better chance to get appropriations then than they would by holding up the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think more money could be obtained in January than could possibly be secured now. We just went the limit. We spent days and nights holding conferences. The Senators know how I felt about the projects. I was thoroughly in favor of them.

While he was in Nebraska, I received a telegram from the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], my devoted friend. We have been devoted friends for many, many years. The matter was of great importance to him.

I felt the committee owed inclusion of the Hartwell Dam to the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is a member of my committee, and has done such wonderful work. I assure him now that at the very first opportunity, in the first appropriate bill we have before the committee, we will include these projects, if it is humanly possible.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have the floor, but I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to pay my respects and announce my wholehearted loyalty personally to the Senate Members of the conference. I regret that I was perhaps indiscreet the other night when I said, as appears at page 9791 of the RECORD, that the Senate "conferees on the civil functions bill gave in, heart, soul, and body, to the conferees of the House."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on page 9791 of the RECORD, in answer to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], be stricken from the permanent RECORD. I know what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] did, and I know what the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and all the Senators on the conference committee did. Of course, I did

not mean to utter such words as slipped from my lips.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator did not.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask unanimous consent that those words be stricken from the permanent RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, "heart, soul, and body" will be stricken from the permanent RECORD.

Mr. MAYBANK. My heart, soul, and body are with the Senators.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Tennessee just said he would do everything possible in January to get "it" into an appropriations bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will change the word to "them."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was going to suggest that the Senator change the word "it" to "them."

Mr. McKELLAR. I have already changed the word.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not wish to criticize; I wish to thank members of the conference, as well as members of the Committee on Appropriations, because I know they have done their best. I seek not to dam waters up, but to dam them out.

The oldest steel center that exists in the United States is the Wheeling-Benwood Steel center. All the fissionable material which might be manufactured could not be delivered to the target without steel. Incidentally, the West Virginia project would be self-liquidating, because in any 10-year period, by reason of normal floods, more money from income taxes is lost from that area than the total cost of the proposed project would be.

I realize that the Senate conferees did the best they could. However, I deplore the narrowness which has been displayed and the holding back by the more numerous body across the Capitol, of bills like the measures we have been considering during the last 2 days until the last minute, thus putting the Senate in a position that is really shameful to face, in such a position that the Senate has to concede matters which they would otherwise never concede. It is my hope that some way may be found to have such bills properly prepared, so that the Senate will have time to effect reasonable compromises.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator knows—

Mr. KILGORE. I hope that a flood wall can be started in order to protect that steel industry at Benwood. The evidence before the Senate committee for such a project was preponderantly favorable.

The same situation exists with respect to the proposed flood wall in the case of the Hartwell Dam. The Corps of Engineers did not submit their report in time. Of course, that was a

governmental failure which is very hard to explain to the flood sufferers, who, every time a flood comes along, have to foot the bill of five or six million dollars in flood damage. Incidentally, the taxpayers of the country bear the loss. In the case of the large corporations it is charged off as damage; but the poor humble people who suffer flood damage can not charge it off. They pay the bill. So the flood damage is far greater than the loss we sustain in income.

At one time I thought of insisting on a quorum. I think we could last possibly until after the fireworks end in Chicago if some Senator should insist on a quorum; but I do not want to punish my colleagues, who have helped me in every way they could. For that reason let me say to my good friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. McKELLAR] of which committee I am proud to be a member, that I am coming back to fight for a dam to keep water out, and not a dam to dam the water back. I shall fight for such a dam in the same way that the proponents of the Ice Harbor Dam will fight. I may say that I spell "dam" in the same way the Senator from Tennessee spells it. In the first possible supplemental bill we shall try to obtain a sufficient appropriation to protect the steel plant to which I have adverted.

I thank the Senators on both sides of the aisle who were in the conference for doing their best to retain this project, which, through no fault of theirs, was eliminated.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was because of the action of the House.

Mr. KILGORE. It would be interesting carefully to inspect the bill to see how many projects were eliminated in certain congressional district which I might mention.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think it is a very wholesome thing that various Senators have made it clear that not just one, not just two projects, but several, have been eliminated from the bill without any fault on the part of the Senate conferees, but because of the exigencies of the situation, and in order that a bill might be enacted before the Congress adjourned.

The item to which the Senator from West Virginia referred was the only item affecting his State. I want him to know that the members of the conference committee from the Senate forcefully called attention to that specific fact as well as to the importance of the project.

Mr. McKELLAR. We did.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. LODGE] were present I would want them to know that we called specific attention to the fact that the only flood-control items in their State, the North Adams and the South Adams projects, were both eliminated and both are meritorious projects. Time after time we called the attention of the House conferees to that fact.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that time and again I brought up the two items from Massachusetts.

They were both small items. It is perfectly outrageous that they were not agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee is correct.

Having sat in this conference for only 2 years, I have been impressed by the meticulous fairness and even-handed justice of the Senator from Tennessee in insisting that the claims of each area and of each great industry and each great activity in the country must be considered on a completely fair basis in comparison with projects relating to other parts of the country and other activities.

With reference to the Ice Harbor project, we had present as an active participant in the conference the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. If anyone ever fought hard for a project, the Senator from Oregon fought hard for the Ice Harbor Dam, as all members of the conference committee will remember. But in fairness to all concerned, it was pointed out that there were already in the bill many large items affecting the Columbia River and its tributaries the Snake, and the Willamette. As I recall, there were nine such projects, totaling some \$137,000,000 in this bill. Every one of them were completely justified, and every one of them had a place in the national-defense picture.

Finally, when there was a yielding at long last with respect to this one project, it was only because it was apparently necessary to yield or have no report and no bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Such is my high opinion of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oregon that I have employed the Senator from Oregon to be my lawyer if I ever get into trouble. Thank the Lord I have never been in serious trouble, but if I ever commit a crime, I am going to have him as my lawyer. I already have the promise of his services. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senate conferees had to go through the very unpleasant experience of yielding with respect to one proposal which we felt probably represented more emergency need than any other project in the bill. It was a comparatively small proposal, involving \$350,000, as I recall, to take care of the situation in a California community which is on the Pacific coast, and which has been adversely affected by a Government structure, to such an extent that the houses are actually being washed away. We had to yield even with respect to that project.

I have been asked about the Tuttle Creek project. We did not yield on that. It is in the bill, with an appropriation of \$5,000,000 instead of \$10,000,000, which the Senate voted. We had to yield, however, with reference to the Toronto project in Kansas, which was to have been begun, but will not be started.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we had to yield on at least two items in Texas, as I recall, one of which hurt me almost as much as not being able to get through the Hartwell Dam. But we had to do it. There was no other way out. Conference is a give-and-take proposition. We must compromise. That is what conference is for. We do the best we can, and we try to be fair to all.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall conclude in a moment.

The conferees put up everything they could in the way of a scrap. The RECORD will show that they gained more than two-thirds of the points at issue between the Senate and the House. While the RECORD will not show it, it is a fact that the conference remained in session, notwithstanding the exhaustion from which most of the conferees were suffering, until midnight on the night before the last night of the session. I have never seen a harder effort put forth; and I think the Senators from South Carolina, Senators from the Northwest, and Senators from all the other areas affected should know that to be the fact, and that some Senators even refused, on the first presentation, to sign the conference report, because they were so completely dissatisfied with the elimination of some of the projects.

I think the conference did everything that was humanly within its power. I think it would be the wise course for the Senate to accept the report as it is, as the best that can be done, and look forward to what may be done after Congress reconvenes next January.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I noticed that the Senator looked in my direction when he said that some of the conferees refused to sign the report on the first presentation of it. The only reason why I signed the report was that that was the only way to have a bill. I was very unhappy over my own problems in connection with the bill, and over what seemed to me to be an attitude of disregarding real merit in making the final decision with respect to projects which were wholly justified, proper, and right under all the circumstances. It does not seem fair to me to say, "We will give you this project if you will take off the next two or three down the list."

Mr. McKELLAR. It is perfectly unfair. It is not the way to legislate. It will be remembered that the Senate conferees were very positive in what they had to say.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We certainly were.

Mr. President, I wish to confirm everything that has been said about the chairman's fight for all these projects. All the conferees fought for them. Finally, at the last moment, I almost felt like not signing the report. I hope that if I ever have the privilege of serving on another conference like this, it will be free from any attitude, apparent attitude, or suspicion of an attitude on the part of some of the conferees of making it a contest between the Senate and the

House of Representatives; but that all the conferees will be motivated by a spirit of serving the country, and if it takes a dollar here and another dollar there, for a necessary domestic project, the money should be provided, particularly when we are spending money all over the world for many things which I doubt have an equivalent value. Mr. President, the time has come when we should meet the issue. Let us stand firm on the basis of justice and right, and serve our country on that basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I felt he was very badly treated. It was very unfortunate indeed, and I was very regretful about it. No man ever made a more gallant fight for what he thought was right and what all of us thought was right, than the Senator from Arkansas. However, owing to a certain situation the result could not be avoided.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. My own State of New York has had projects eliminated or greatly reduced. The result has caused me much disappointment. I think it has been injurious to the people of the State and to the people of the Northeast. However, I wish to make it very clear that I have been informed that the Senate conferees worked fairly and industriously and with great devotion to maintain an even balance and to secure approval of projects which were in the public interest. I am grateful to them for it. I raise no objection whatever. I express my appreciation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, first of all I want to reiterate what I said earlier, namely, that I too appreciate the efforts of the Senate conferees in connection with this bill and I appreciate what the leadership is trying to do. As a matter of fact, I hope the impression is not abroad that the House of Representatives as a body was a party to bringing about this situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House was not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House was not. As a matter of fact, I know there were many Members of the House who attempted to help straighten out the situation; but in the case of this particular appropriation the whole situation got down to the House conferees, and, perhaps, to be perfectly honest, it might be said that it got down to just one or two of the House conferees.

I suppose in legislative procedure that is perfectly proper and perfectly legal; but, like the chairman of the committee, I think it is extremely disappointing and discouraging.

I do not want to place the Ice Harbor project, because it happens to be in the State of Washington, in the category, as someone has said, of a pork-barrel appropriation. It is not that at all. There were many projects in the bill. As a matter of fact, if I wanted to speak in that sectional frame of mind, I would

point to a project in the bill which is located in the State of one of the conferees who objected to the other projects. However, that is neither here nor there.

We are discussing two projects, one of them located in my State, and the other one in South Carolina.

The Ice Harbor project has been placed in appropriation bills by the Senate not once but three times. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget on three occasions. It has been recommended for many years by those who are supposed to examine the feasibility and necessity of such projects. It has been authorized for many years. So far as I know, the planning, in the main, has been completed. All that has been added to the support of the Ice Harbor project is that the Atomic Energy Commission, from whom I have a letter, recommends it vigorously this year, as it vigorously recommended it last year.

Mr. President, a great deal was said on Saturday night about the importance of atomic energy. As the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has said, a great many components go to make up the defense effort. Steel and aluminum are two of them. We have in the State of Washington a great atomic energy plant at Hanford, which produces the ingredients of the atomic bomb in bulk. It is probably the greatest plant in the Nation. Most of us know what it does.

We also have a giant power pool in the Pacific Northwest from which all the industries involved in the defense effort draw power. Sixteen or eighteen months ago the power load on that line was so great that the power was cut off for a certain period of time. It seriously alarmed the Atomic Energy Commission management, because the process is a chain process; once power goes off it takes weeks to bring operations back to normal and to produce what is needed for our defense.

Ice Harbor Dam is a good dam in its own right, and is feasible. It is reimbursable with interest. However, because it happens to be a few miles up the river from the atomic energy plant, the same situation is involved as at Hartwell with reference to cool water.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator will yield, he refers to the cool Columbia River; is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. The Atomic Energy Commission thought it ought to have a source of uninterrupted power. In other words, if something happened to the pool power line, a switch could be thrown, and power would come from a few miles away, generated at a dam which is not only feasible in its own right, but has the added defense value.

The Ice Harbor project is not new to the Senate. It has been before the Senate for a long time. It has been before the House for a long time.

Let me say something else for the RECORD, Mr. President. There was a controversy in the beginning as to whether or not the Ice Harbor Dam would destroy some of the fish runs on the Columbia River. No one wants to

do that. There was a time when there was a controversy between the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Army engineers, the atomic-energy plant, and the Bonneville Power Administration as to whether or not the dam might affect the fish runs. The first time the project was rejected, it was for that reason. This time the atomic-energy situation has been added to the picture. I have a long letter from the Fish and Wildlife Service pointing out the necessity of the project and declaring that the dam would have no more effect on the fish in the Columbia River than a dam on any other river, and that they could take care of the situation. I have a letter from the Department of the Interior to that effect. Everyone is in favor of the dam but the House conferees, and perhaps only a few of them.

I have a telegram from the President of the United States directed to the chairman of the conferees, in which he says:

I strongly urge that appropriation for starting Ice Harbor Dam be included in Army civil-functions appropriations bill as recommended in 1953 budget. Aside from other considerations, power from this dam is very important to the new atomic-energy expansion program. We should not delay starting this dam any longer.

That telegram was sent by the Commander in Chief. There is not one person in the Government with any responsibility in this matter who is against beginning work on the Ice Harbor Dam, not only for the usual reasons that it would provide cheap electric power and be reimbursable to the Government with interest, but because of the fact that it would provide an addition to the power pool.

The only ones who are against the Ice Harbor project are a few House conferees. They always leave the civil-functions bill to the last. They always wait to have a conference on the civil-functions bill until the end of the session, so they can say, "All right, if you don't agree, you can't have any bill at all." The first conference was held on July Fourth, with the knowledge that we were at the end of the session.

This is the third time the Senate has voted for the construction of the Ice Harbor Dam. The Senate took that action, not merely because I asked for it, but because the feasibility and necessity of the Ice Harbor Dam are so clearly established in the minds of the Members of the Senate. In fact, the Members of both the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee are so keenly aware of the necessity as well as the feasibility of the Ice Harbor Dam, that this year I did not even appear before the Appropriations Committee, but merely submitted to the committee a statement in which I repeated what I have said about this matter for many, many years.

Mr. President, perhaps we should change the rules, if two or three conferees on the part of the House are able to prevent a development of this sort, after so many responsible persons have asked for its construction.

Mr. President, it is true that we are building up the West with the help of many able Senators, such as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] and the conferees on the part of the Senate on the civil functions bill. It is true that many appropriations have been made for the construction of public power projects in the West, such as the Chief Joseph Dam, the McNary Dam, and the other dams about which the Senator from Oregon and I know a great deal. However, those projects have nothing to do with this one.

Mr. President, I heard some of the conferees say, "If the Ice Harbor Dam is built, Congress will have to provide funds for the building of three other dams on the Snake River." Of course, Mr. President, the over-all plan for the Snake River provides for the construction of three or four more dams, and also for construction of the very controversial Hells Canyon Dam. However, the Ice Harbor Dam stands by itself. The other dams do not have to be built unless their feasibility is proved.

Mr. President, I am becoming very tired of hearing the words "pork barrel." These projects are so-called "reimbursable projects," in that the cost of their construction will be paid back to the Government, with interest. As a matter of fact, we are way ahead in our repayment schedule. The only reason why we came to the Government in this case is that these developments are so big that no combination of private interests could raise the funds required.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that the power potentials of the Columbia River Basin alone are sufficient to take care of all the power needs of the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course that is true. If we could find some method of transportation, whereby power would not be lost and boosters—which would add to the cost per kilowatt-hour would not be needed—it would be perfectly possible to do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the development of a country such as ours, I still maintain that we have not even scratched the surface, so far as the power potentials are concerned. Furthermore, we need more power.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course we do. Already we have used every bit of power we have developed at these projects. All that power has been used for defense purposes or for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Such developments create wealth, taxes, work, and manpower, do they not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, they do.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I remember that when I was a young Member of the House of Representatives some 16 years ago, and when we obtained one of the first appropriations for construction of the Grand Coulee Dam, Member after Member of the House—including Members on both sides of the aisle—would stand and would ask, "What will

be done with the power? Will it be sold to the jack rabbits out there in the sagebrush?"

Of course, Mr. President, the Grand Coulee Dam cost a great deal of money to build, but today the average citizen knows that that dam is worth four times what the Government has spent on it. The United States Government has never lost a nickel on its investments in these projects.

In our section of the country we are a little more fortunate, in that our rivers run directly to the sea. However, I have yet to see one public works project that has been developed by the Congress that has not proved to be worth what it cost; in fact, sometimes these projects have proved to be worth twice, three times, or four times their cost. However, whenever we propose any of these developments, the opponents pick on the cost figures, and shout pork barrel.

Mr. President, the public works which have been developed by the United States Government have the greatest capital asset value of anything the Government has done.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the case of such developments in the Northwest, the West and the Southwest, including the TVA developments, the Government has never lost a nickel; in fact, those developments have made money for the Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course they have.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I concur in everything the Senator from Washington has said regarding the national gain as a result of development of the water-power resources of the country.

However, I do not think this matter relates only to the development of water power in the West, the Northwest, the Southwest, and the South. In New York State we have two great water-power resources—resources as great as the Bonneville Dam, the Grand Coulee Dam, and the other potential resources of water power throughout the country. I refer, of course, to the Niagara River and to the St. Lawrence River, whose waters now are going to waste, as they are allowed to flow out to sea. As a result, we are not developing even a small fraction of the potential water-power resources at our disposal. Thus we are failing to make the great gain which could be made not only for New York State—for my interest is in the entire country, not only in New York State—but also for the United States as a whole. The completion of that development would be a gain to Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the entire northeastern section of the country.

Yet when we proposed the development of water power on the St. Lawrence River, both Houses voted down that project. They also voted down the proposal for the St. Lawrence seaway.

When we proposed the development of the Niagara River, the Senate voted reasonable appropriations for the making of studies and plans in that connection, but last year the appropriation was cut off, and this year the appropriation of \$900,000 was reduced to \$100,000.

I can say to you, Mr. President, that I have voted for every great power development since I came to the Senate 3 years ago. I shall continue to do so, because I do not think water-power development is a local matter at all. It is a matter of national interest. What helps the State of Washington or the State of Florida or the State of South Carolina, also helps New York. Similarly, what helps New York helps the other States.

I mention this matter only because I shall continue to fight for the reasonable demands for the development of water power all over the Nation. On the other hand, I must ask that New York and the entire northeastern section of the country also be given a fair break, which they have not had.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am sure the distinguished Senator from New York knows that he has had my support in the fight he has made. I believe New England needs another TVA. At the present time I see New England gradually relegating itself almost to a vacation center. People and industry are leaving New England. The reason for that is the lack of power in New England and the highest power rates in the United States—all because of the failure to develop power. That is why I say these developments should be made there.

Mr. President, it is very difficult to understand the opposition to these developments. Both the Ice Harbor Dam and the Hartwell Dam could be built for the cost of one battleship, although I guarantee that their value to the country will be equal to that of a thousand battleships. That will be the case for years and years to come, and those developments will pay back the money they cost, with interest.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I have no doubt that if the United States were willing to sell the water-power developments which have been made up to now, in all parts of the country, the Nation would realize from them more than the principal which has been expended and the interest on that principal; in fact, I am sure the Nation would realize from them very much more than that. The private power companies would be delighted to buy those projects.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, they would. Let me say that I have never yet had anyone point out to me a so-called "white elephant" in a public-works project. All of these projects have been worth what we paid for them, and in many cases they have been worth much more than that.

If the United States were to keep books on these projects in the way that an ordinary business establishment would do, and if, in that connection, the United States used a conservative figure as the value of these developments, I am sure

the final figure in the account would be in the black. There can be no question of that, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield further to me, let me say that his remarks have brought up memories of another day.

From 1926 to 1933, one of the Senators from Washington was Clarence Dill. Mr. Dill was a Senator when President Roosevelt was elected.

Mr. Dill was extremely interested in the development of the dams about which the Senator from Washington has just spoken—the Grand Coulee Dam, Bonneville Dam, and the other dams.

In January 1933, before Mr. Roosevelt took office, he invited Mr. Dill, the late Senator Norris, and myself to come to see him to talk to him. I do not think Senator Norris ever took much of an interest in water-power development, except in the newspapers, but Senator Dill was very active in looking after the interest of water-power developments in the State of Washington, at that time, and he is entitled to the greatest credit for what he did. The remarks of the Senator from Washington recall the trip we took to Muscle Shoals.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield in a moment. Former Senator Dill, of course, was a very distinguished Senator from Washington, and one who did more, I think, to make this development in the State of Washington possible than any other man whom I know.

Mr. President, I am not going to take the time of the Senate further. I merely want to point out—and I do not say it particularly in regard to the State of Washington, the State of Oregon, the State of Idaho, or the State of Georgia—that the hydroelectric projects in this country are not only worth more than we put into them, but that they are also repaying the Government with interest, while at the same time creating a vast amount of new wealth with which to provide not only for the demands of an increasing population, but also the demands in connection with defense.

Mr. President, I desire to place in the RECORD this statement, in order that the RECORD may be clear. I understand that I have at least the best possible assurance that could be given individually on the part of the Senate conferees that, in connection with the first supplemental bill to come before the Senate in the future, we shall have an opportunity to take this matter up again, and in plenty of time.

Mr. MAYBANK. We certainly shall.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That applies to any and all worthy projects, including Ice Harbor Dam.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear as to the unanimity of opinion, not only regarding the necessity, but also the feasibility of this dam, I want to place in the RECORD a very vigorous and strong letter which I received from the Atomic Energy Commission dated May 27 of this year—as late as that, Mr. President—which letter concludes as follows:

It does appear to us, however, that the proximity of the Ice Harbor Dam to our Hanford Works would be a feasible and sound means of strengthening the Bonneville system so that they would have added system capacity to enable them to supply Hanford with its increased requirements and to afford added assurance against power interruptions.

I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1952.
HON. WARREN MAGNUSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: In accordance with your request to the Atomic Energy Commission for a statement of its views on the Bonneville Power Administration's proposal to construct Ice Harbor Dam, we submit the following:

The Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford Works located in Washington State receives its operating power from the Bonneville Power Administration. In order to maintain our rate of production with the requisite degree of safety we must have a reliable, trouble-free, noninterruptible source of power supply. Because of overloading and other factors on the Bonneville system, we have over the past few years experienced several power outages which have caused loss in plutonium production and created potential hazards.

As you know, we are presently completing several new facilities at our Hanford Works. These facilities will add to our power requirements and thus to our demands on the Bonneville system for additional electric energy.

In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission has proposed an expansion program which includes further expansion at Hanford. We are hopeful that the fund request for this proposed expansion will be submitted to the Congress within a few days. If this program is approved by the Congress, substantially as submitted, it, plus our normal load growth, will cause our power requirements for Hanford to more than double our present-day load. We would expect the Bonneville Power Administration to supply this power since our present and proposed facilities are within the area served by the Bonneville Power Administration.

On May 5, 1952, the manager of our Hanford operations office wrote the Bonneville Power Administration and advised them of this potential load growth. In this letter it was stated that we assumed Bonneville would supply this load and if necessary to do so, would cut nonessential users off to provide adequate service to the Commission. Bonneville Power Administration replied to this letter on May 9, 1952, indicating their willingness to supply the added requirement but stating that the only way they can do so is through added system capacity. We understand from informal discussions with Bonneville that there are three alternate methods by which they could strengthen their system to meet this requirement. We have not examined these three alternate methods in detail because we do not believe it is our function to determine which method would be the most feasible. We feel this to be the responsibility of the Bonneville Power Administration. It does appear to us, however, that the proximity of the Ice Harbor Dam to our Hanford Works would be a feasible and sound means of strengthening the Bonneville system so that they would have added system capacity to enable them to supply Hanford with its increased require-

ment and to afford added assurance against power interruptions.

Should you desire any more information, we will, of course, be pleased to supply it.

Very truly yours,

M. W. BOYER,
General Manager.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also want to place in the RECORD a lengthy letter from the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, dated June 20, 1952, pointing out that the so-called controversy in regard to this matter is solved, insofar as they are concerned.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1952.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: The Senate has voted a \$3,000,000 appropriation to initiate construction on Ice Harbor Dam. I judge the civil functions bill will soon be in conference. Since there has been controversy in regard to the Ice Harbor project, with particular reference to its effect on the salmon runs, I thought it desirable to supplement the information contained in Mr. Day's letter addressed to you under date of March 18, 1952.

In that letter Mr. Day stated that our plans for handling upstream and downstream migration of anadromous fish will eliminate any threat of exterminating any species of salmon. He indicated further that we believe there will be some losses but that the fishery interests are prepared, through the best possible devices known to modern science, to keep those losses at a minimum—thus insuring that everything possible is being done to perpetuate the fishery resources in the Columbia River watershed as they may be affected by the Ice Harbor project.

Plans for Ice Harbor Dam call for fish facilities similar to those now under construction at McNary Dam, including collection systems, ladders from each shore, and temporary ladders for passage while the dam is under construction. The two permanent ladders at Ice Harbor consist of a series of interconnected stepped pools 30 feet long and 20 feet wide with a rise of 1 foot at each step, at an estimated cost to the Corps of Engineers of approximately \$9,000,000. We will incorporate in the Ice Harbor fish facilities any improvements that may be dictated by the operating experience at McNary Dam. The McNary passageways will be in operation for at least 2 years prior to construction of the permanent facilities at Ice Harbor. The McNary facilities represent an improvement over facilities installed at Bonneville Dam in 1938.

While the Corps of Engineers has the responsibility of construction, our field representatives have cooperated fully with the corps in planning and designing fish facilities for this project. Thus, the latest scientific and biological knowledge available to us will be incorporated in our over-all plan for protecting the fishery resource at this project.

The records of 15 years of experience in operating the dam facilities on the Columbia River with the provision of fish-passing facilities, fish hatcheries, and other means of offsetting losses, have been reasonably effective in preserving salmon runs on that river.

The Fish and Wildlife Service will cooperate in every way with the Corps of Engineers

in assuring that fish passageways are integrated in the Ice Harbor project. This Service will also cooperate with the corps to make certain that the salmon runs are properly handled during the construction period.

Mr. Albert M. Day, the Director of the Service, is out of the city. I, therefore, am sending you this letter which explains the position of this Service with reference to the fish problem at Ice Harbor lock and dam.

Sincerely yours,

J. L. KASK,
Assistant Director.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Department of the Interior, also dated June 20, 1952, setting forth in great detail the necessity for this project, and attaching a statement of Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, stressing the vital necessity of proceeding with this dam.

There being no objection, the letter, with its attachment, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1952.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I appreciate your letter of June 19, 1952, in which you express your deep interest in the continued comprehensive development of the Columbia River. I am pleased to set out in this letter the answers to the three questions raised in the House committee report in connection with the Ice Harbor lock and dam, Washington.

In regard to the question that Ice Harbor Dam will not have an irreparable effect on the fish runs the following information has been obtained in collaboration with the Fish and Wildlife Service of this Department.

The fish facilities to be constructed as an integral part of the Ice Harbor project are similar to fish ladders now under construction at McNary Dam, including collection system, ladders from each shore, and temporary ladders for passage during construction. The two Ice Harbor ladders will be 30 feet long and 20 feet wide, with a rise of 1 foot at each step. Design and construction of Ice Harbor fish facilities will benefit from at least 2 years of operating experience at McNary Dam. McNary ladders have been improved as a result of the experience at Bonneville Dam.

Over the years there has been a continued effort to evaluate the effect of construction of main-stem dams on the Columbia River fishery resource. The records of 15 years of operation of the dam facilities on the Columbia River with the provision of fish-passing facilities, fish hatcheries, and other means of offsetting losses have been fairly effective in preserving salmon runs on that river. The provision of proper fish facilities, such as will be installed at Ice Harbor Dam, will eliminate any threat of exterminating any species of salmon by that project.

The use of the 15-percent loss at each dam has not been substantiated by experience. Scientific developments today indicate a continuing fishery resource on the Columbia River if the Congress will provide necessary appropriation for a continuing cooperative engineering and biological research program.

With respect to the fishery of the Cowlitz River the Federal Power Commission's license to construct this project requires approval of the plans for fish handling facilities in advance of construction to insure propagation of the fish runs on this stream. The license

requires that the licensee cooperate with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Fisheries and Game of the State of Washington in the preparation of such plans and requires modification to protect fish as may be needed during operation of the project. In the case of the Pelton project on the Deschutes River the Department recommended facilities for the protection of the migratory fish in the event a license was issued for the project. Similarly these plans must be approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Oregon State Game and Fish Commission.

In light of the above facts I can assure you that the Fish and Wildlife Service of this Department will cooperate in every way possible to minimize any possible effects of Ice Harbor on the fishery resource of the Snake River.

In answer to the question as to whether the power needs of the area cannot be supplied from other sources I refer to my testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Civil Functions Appropriations. At these hearings I directed attention to the seriousness of the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest by pointing out that all private and public utilities in the Pacific Northwest were united as to the need for an additional 500,000 kilowatts annually for the next several years to meet the normal load growth in the area; the equivalent of a hydro-generating plant the size of Bonneville each year. I further advise the committee that superimposed on the existing defense loads in the Pacific Northwest is a proposed major expansion of the Hanford Works of the Atomic Energy Commission. We have explored all possible means of supplying the additional Hanford load and have arrived at a decision that Bonneville Power Administration cannot undertake to serve the additional load at Hanford because such service would be at the expense of contractual commitments to other loads in the area. Unless new generation is provided for the expanded Hanford load, the power supply of the region will be crippled and there will be cut-backs to industrial defense loads, private utilities, and public agencies.

Attached is a copy of Dr. Paul J. Raver's Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, statement before the Senate Civil Functions Appropriation Committee. It reinforces my position as to absolute necessity for immediately constructing Ice Harbor Dam. Dr. Raver's statement presents facts and figures on possible alternative proposals for providing the electrical service for the expansion at Hanford Works of the Atomic Energy Commission and clearly proves that there is no economical alternative to Ice Harbor Dam. Further, it makes evident that any alternative which does not provide additional new generation will seriously cripple the power supply of the Pacific Northwest and will result in cut-backs to industrial defense loads, private utilities, and public customers in the area.

The problem of providing an adequate and reliable source of power for the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford Works has been a matter of grave concern to this department since initial construction of this vital defense plant. The Bonneville Power Administration has been conferring with the Atomic Energy engineering people at Hanford continuously since June of 1950 in order to arrive at an engineering solution which would assure an independent and reliable source of power for the Hanford Works. After exploring all possibilities it has become obvious to all concerned that the immediate construction of Ice Harbor, which is located only 7 miles from the plant, is the only economical and practical solution to this problem.

As recently as June 9, 1952, Mr. Gordon Dean, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Com-

mission, stated in a letter to me, copy of which is attached: "It is our understanding that Senator MAGNUSON used this letter (containing information to the effect that AEC proposes to double the power load at Hanford) in connection with Senate Appropriation Committee hearings on the proposed construction of Ice Harbor Dam."

"At the same time, however, we feel that if Congress approves the AEC proposed expansion at Hanford and does not provide additional generating capacity on the Bonneville system, it will be necessary for some Government agency, possibly the Office of Defense Mobilization, to critically review the consumers on the Bonneville system to determine whether or not service can be curtailed to any of the consumers without material interference to national defense and the growing economy of the Northwest, in order to supply power needed by our Hanford Works."

My office has contacted the Corps of Engineers relative to the question as to whether navigation benefits of Ice Harbor, without construction of other projects, are significant. Attached is a statement furnished by that agency. In summary the attached statement prepared by that agency reveals that average annual commerce on and through the Ice Harbor pool over the life of the project is estimated at 2,547,000 tons, and will consist of the upstream movement of petroleum products, building materials, and manufactured products, and the downstream movement of limestone, ores, wheat and other agricultural products, and timber. Average annual navigation benefits for Ice Harbor, based on savings in transportation costs are estimated at \$1,250,000. When completed, Ice Harbor will provide navigation benefits of \$300,000 annually. These benefits will increase progressively as other authorized navigation facilities are completed. It may be noted, also, that with only the initial navigation benefits, the Ice Harbor project is still justified economically, and has a favorable benefit-cost ratio.

In closing I wish to take this opportunity to remind you that appropriations for the construction of the authorized Ice Harbor project have been continuously sought since 1949. Its extreme importance to our defense effort has now been attested to by the Defense Electric Power Administration and it has had the complete endorsement of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Bureau of the Budget and the Executive Office of the President. There is complete unanimity among all defense agencies of the administration that this project should be constructed and integrated into the Pacific Northwest grid in such a manner as to provide an independent power supply for the Hanford Works of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Department of the Interior again wishes to give assurance that the Fish and Wildlife Service will collaborate with the Corps of Engineers in providing fish facilities which will be required to protect and preserve the migratory fish. I am heartened by the fact that the Senate has seen fit to provide \$3,000,000 to initiate construction of this project and trust that the facts which have been set forth herein will answer all questions in order that this important work can go forward immediately.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

STATEMENT OF PAUL J. RAVEN, ADMINISTRATOR, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, UNITED STATES SENATE, ON MAY 14, 1952

The Bonneville Power Administration has met with the Pacific Northwest Utility Conference Committee to discuss the power

supply situation in the Pacific Northwest region in light of the action of the House of Representatives on the civil functions appropriation bill. The deficiencies indicated by the representatives of the committee do not take into account the requirements of the Hanford works of the Atomic Energy Commission. The requirements of the AEC present two problems which have to be met. One is the quality of electrical service and the other is additional power for a proposed expansion.

We have made an analysis of the various methods by which the atomic energy load at Hanford works might be adequately served. I have furnished the chairman of the Appropriations Committee with a copy of a classified letter from the Atomic Energy Commission which sets forth their electric power requirements. The manager of the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford plant has made it clear to us that he expects the Bonneville Power Administration to take care of their needs and in so doing to provide the quality of service which would assure uninterrupted continuity of electric power to Hanford. Three possible plans of service have been developed which do assure the necessary quality of electric service to Hanford. These, along with a table of comparative costs, are as follows:

PLAN A. ICE HARBOR

This method of service to Hanford utilizes the generation at Ice Harbor Dam to supply the increased requirements of the AEC. Small transmission additions are included to permit this power to be supplied into the 230-kilovolt loop at a suitable point thus providing the desired degree of reliability of service. Costs used for Ice Harbor generation are those applying prior to the construction of additional upstream storage and are based on a 67 percent plant factor.

PLAN B. STEAM PLANT AT HANFORD WITH BACK-UP TRANSMISSION FROM McNARY DAM

Install adequate steam-generating facilities at some appropriate location on the Hanford reservation. This steam plant will be operated on an approximate 50 percent plant factor which would coordinate economically with hydro generation on the system thus increasing firm power of the region. To assure adequate emergency reliability to AEC at such times when the steam plant is not in operation, an additional 230-kilovolt circuit from McNary Dam to the AEC 230-kilovolt system would be needed.

PLAN C. STEAM PLANT AT A COASTAL LOAD CENTER WITH BACK-UP TRANSMISSION FROM McNARY DAM

Install adequate steam generating facilities remote from Hanford reservation at some appropriate location on the Bonneville system and supply transmission backup to Hanford from McNary Dam in plan B. This plan would permit the region to take advantage of transmission benefits due to the strategic location of the steam plant. By utilizing the Federal transmission grid it is possible to operate this steam plant at approximately 50 percent plant factor.

Cost to Federal Government of system additions chargeable to AEC load

Source of power	Investment	Annual requirements ¹
Plan A. Ice Harbor and system hydro.....	² \$102,015,000	\$4,730,000
Plan B. Steam at Hanford.....	³ 44,400,000	7,710,000
Plan C. Steam on coast.....	⁴ 43,900,000	5,430,000

¹ Includes interest, amortization, replacement, maintenance, and operation cost including fuel.

² Includes: Ice Harbor, \$74,150,000 (does not include \$33,550,000 allocated to other purposes); system hydro, \$26,200,000; transmission back-up, \$1,665,000; total, \$102,015,000.

³ Includes: Steam plant, \$42,200,000; transmission back-up, \$2,200,000; total, \$44,400,000.

⁴ Includes: Steam plant, \$41,700,000; transmission back-up, \$2,200,000; to al. \$43,900,000.

In summary, the Bonneville Power Administration's studies of loads and resources in the Northwest over the next 5 years have included Ice Harbor Dam in the resources because it was an authorized project closest to the Hanford area and had been recommended for construction as early as 1949. Furthermore, all possible new generation is required to take care of estimated loads in the Pacific Northwest without the addition of any heavy industrial loads. Even with the provision of Ice Harbor Dam serious shortages will exist.

Last year, when Congress failed to approve appropriations for Ice Harbor, our ability to take care of our loads was reduced by the capability of that project, almost 200,000 kilowatts. This situation was made even worse when we were informed recently that there was to be an increase (the amount of the increase in AEC load is classified information which has been furnished to the Chairman of the Committee) over previously estimated loads of the Atomic Energy plant at Hanford. This increase had not been included in the Pacific Northwest loads. Therefore, this year Bonneville Power Administration recommended very strongly that Ice Harbor be resubmitted to Congress, and agreed that with the restoration of this plant the Administration would take care of the increased load at Hanford. However, if Ice Harbor is not restored, the Administration cannot undertake to serve the additional Hanford load because such service would be at the expense of contractual commitments to other loads in the area. The only alternative is to construct new steam generation. It is our understanding that the capacity for manufacturing steam turbines is so fully loaded that additional steam generating facilities for Hanford could be provided only by displacing equipment now scheduled for other parts of the country. Hydro manufacturing capacity on the other hand is reported to be less critical. There is no practical alternative to the immediate construction of Ice Harbor Dam if the expansion of the atomic energy load at Hanford is to be provided with a satisfactory amount and source of power. Therefore any alternative which does not provide additional new generation will seriously cripple the power supply of the Pacific Northwest and will result in cut-backs to industrial defense loads, private utilities and the public customers in the region.

UNITED STATES,
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1952.

HON. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of May 20, 1952, which was in relation to our potential added power requirements at Hanford.

We appreciate the concern expressed by you and previously by the Bonneville Power Administration officials concerning this added load on their system. However, with our Hanford works, located as it is on the Bonneville network, it is, of course, only feasible that we look to Bonneville for the supply of power. We are hopeful that the Congress will authorize the necessary funds to strengthen the Bonneville Power Administration's system and, of course, are willing to at any time advise the interested congressional committees of our requirements and our interest in seeing the Bonneville system strengthened.

We have recently written Senator MAGNUSON a letter setting forth these interests, a copy of which has been sent to you. It is our understanding that Senator MAGNUSON used this letter in connection with Senate Appropriation Committee hearings on the proposed construction of Ice Harbor Dam.

At the same time, however, we feel that if Congress approves the AEC proposed expansion at Hanford and does not provide

additional generating capacity on the Bonneville system, it will be necessary for some Government agency, possibly the Office of Defense Mobilization, to critically review the consumers on the Bonneville system to determine whether or not service can be curtailed to any of the consumers without material interference to national defense and the growing economy of the Northwest, in order to supply power needed by our Handford works.

As stated previously, we are hopeful that you are able to obtain authorization for additional generating capacity and the curtailment of the consumers along the Bonneville system will not be necessary.

We appreciate the fine cooperation our people receive from Bonneville Power Administration officials and also appreciate your assurance of the continued cooperation of the Department of the Interior in regard to this matter.

Very truly yours,

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY
COMMISSION.
GORDON DEAN, *Chairman.*

STATEMENT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ON NAVIGATION BENEFITS FROM ICE HARBOR DAM, JUNE 20, 1952

Ultimate full development of the navigation potential of Ice Harbor Dam and Reservoir area depends on the opening up to water transportation the extensive natural resources of northern Idaho and eastern Washington and the markets of this area. During the interim period, until this full program is realized, construction of the McNary and The Dalles Dams will materially improve existing navigation on the lower 330 miles of the Columbia River. Construction of Ice Harbor Dam will permit extension of this navigation through the lower 45 miles of the Snake River for year-round use and, by drowning out some of the most treacherous rapids, will make continuous navigation possible on the remainder of the river up to Lewiston during the higher stream flow period, generally April through September. With the present construction of the Columbia Basin project by the Bureau of Reclamation and additional markets and agricultural products will be developed tributary to the lower Snake River. Current inquiries are being made by organizations from that region and the large wheat producing areas both north and south of the river for frontage on Ice Harbor Reservoir for commercial development. Similar inquiries also are being made by oil companies in the region. In addition, Walla Walla County is currently planning a port commission with expressed interest for early development of water frontage on this pool. The trade area served by Ice Harbor pool will include portions of the Columbia Basin project, Ritzville, Lind, Washitucna and Connell. Seasonal water transportation will be provided for the big wheat producing area of Colfax, Pullman, Rosalia, and as far north as Spokane, together with western Idaho. Petroleum products would move to these same general areas with a joint barge-truck movement or barge-pipeline movement extending well beyond Spokane and into the northern arm of Idaho.

Ice Harbor Dam, when completed as a single unit in extension of the Columbia River navigation system, will afford navigation benefits conservatively estimated at about \$300,000 annually to the region. These benefits would be independent of those which would accrue later from future development of the remaining three dams of the lower Snake River project. They are made up of estimated transportation savings on grain originating along the Ice Harbor pool, an estimated limited movement of grain through Ice Harbor pool from up-

stream areas and a limited movement of oil upstream into and through the Ice Harbor pool as an extension of a well-established petroleum movement on the Columbia River.

Average annual commerce on and through the Ice Harbor pool over the life of the project is estimated at 2,547,000 tons, and will consist of the upstream movement of petroleum products, building materials, and manufactured products, and the downstream movement of limestone, ores, wheat, and other agricultural products, and timber. Average annual navigation benefits for Ice Harbor, based on savings in transportation costs are estimated at \$1,250,000. When completed, Ice Harbor will provide navigation benefits of \$300,000 annually. These benefits will increase progressively as other authorized navigation facilities are completed. It may be noted, also, that with only the initial navigation benefits, the Ice Harbor project is still justified economically, and has a favorable benefit-cost ratio.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Charles S. Murphy, addressed to the chairman of the Senate conferees, as to the necessity of this dam.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEY WEST, FLA., March 13, 1952.
Hon. WARREN MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

President is sending following telegram to Congressman CANNON: "Strongly urge that appropriation for starting Ice Harbor Dam be included in Army civil functions appropriations bill as recommended in 1953 budget. Aside from other considerations, power from this dam is very important to the new atomic energy expansion program. We should not delay starting this dam any longer."

CHARLES S. MURPHY.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, with those matters in the RECORD, I hope that between now and January the Representatives who served as conferees on the part of the House in connection with the matter will have an opportunity to read them. I yield the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to make a request to file certain material.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that Senators wishing to place matters in the RECORD permit the Chair first to put the motion of the Senator from Tennessee, which is necessary in order to dispose of the matter now before the Senate. Following that, there will be ample time for insertions in the RECORD, and it would accommodate the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly will accommodate the Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the vote of the Senate disagreeing to the conference report be reconsidered and that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7268, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

July 5, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

"The following appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control may be used for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase not to exceed 200 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only in the current fiscal year and hire of passenger motor vehicles and purchase of one motorboat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft: *Provided further*, That the reservoir formed by the Blakely Mountain Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as 'Lake Ouachita,' and the reservoir formed by the Narrows Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as 'Lake Greeson': *Provided further*, That the project known as 'Burr Oak Dam, Ohio,' shall hereafter be designated as the 'Tom Jenkins Dam, Ohio': *Provided further*, That \$125,000 of the funds appropriated herein may be used for providing a suitable access road and bridge from the town of Blum, Tex., to the Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railroad station, relocated in connection with the construction of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$250,000 of the funds appropriated herein may be expended for providing a suitable access road from United States Highway 70 north to the bridge built upon and across the Center Hill Dam in DeKalb County, Tenn.: *Provided further*, That not more than \$40,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for expenditure, in addition to funds heretofore made available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, to pay to lawful occupants of properties within the towns of Elbowoods, Sanish, and Van Hook, N. Dak., for their improvements which will be rendered useless by the construction of the project, but for which compensation may not be made under existing law because of the occupants' limited right of occupancy: *Provided further*, That payment in each case shall be limited to the fair value of the improvements, or the cost of moving such improvements to the site of the new combined town, whichever is less, as determined by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated shall not be expended for the payment of business losses or other losses incident to the acquisition of lands for this project."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 2 be agreed to by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion is agreed to. The House amendment to Senate amendment No. 2 is agreed to. That ends the matter.

The Chair would like to congratulate the Senator from Tennessee, as chairman, upon the fine work done by him and his associates in the Senate Committee on Appropriations and in the subcommittee, including the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. All and sundry have done everything possible to complete this legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to thank very heartily the distinguished President of the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TO PRINT CERTAIN MATTERS IN THE RECORD

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted, following the adjournment of Congress, to file and have printed in the RECORD for the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency a report of the activities of the committee during the Eighty-second Congress.

I also ask unanimous consent to file and have printed in the RECORD any reports from the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Summary of legislative record of Senator MOODY of Michigan.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Address delivered by Dr. C. O. Watkins at the Toastmasters Club in Sidney, Mont.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Article entitled "FEPC Is Political Fraud Says Negro Newspaperman," published in the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette of July 4, 1952.

Article entitled "Race Issue Has Nation Boiling: Public Misled as to Facts," written by Davis Lee, and published in the Newark, (N. J.) Telegram of February 10, 1952.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 240, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, July 5, 1952, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be amended by striking out "Saturday, July 5, 1952" and inserting "Monday, July 7, 1952."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. Without objection, the concurrent resolution, as amended, is agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 241, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND submitted the following order, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Ordered, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the present Congress, the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives after such adjournment.

AUTHORIZATION OF VICE PRESIDENT TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS OR COMMITTEES

Mr. McFARLAND submitted the following order, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Ordered, That, notwithstanding the final adjournment of the session, the Vice President be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATOR McFARLAND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS IN A CERTAIN CONTINGENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following order, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Ordered, That if delay ensues in the enrollment of any bills or joint resolutions, and the Vice President or the President pro tempore is not available to sign the same when duly enrolled, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] be, and he is hereby, authorized to sign such bills or joint resolutions as Acting President pro tempore.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY AND PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long. I merely rise to pay tribute to our majority leader for the outstanding work performed by him during the past few days, particularly in connection with the atomic-energy program. I am inti-

mately acquainted with the work carried through by him as of yesterday. I know that he stayed up until 7 a. m. Sunday morning following a 5 a. m. session of this body; and yet, before the noon hour of that day he was calling me on his telephone. He was back at work within 3 hours after having gone to his room. But for his patient and painstaking efforts, the resolution of the differences between the two Houses might not have been accomplished. I pay tribute to him for what I consider to be an act of great leadership in guiding us through the settlement of a most vital problem. It would have been a tragic mistake had this Congress adjourned without having fully clarified the meaning and intent of the Congress insofar as the atomic energy development is concerned.

I also pay tribute to the conferees and to all the members of the Appropriations Committee. I felt very strongly about this matter, Mr. President, and I can go home now, feeling that we have done our job, and have done it well.

One final word. I regret that we have had to curb our activities in terms of certain public works developments. I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in his remarkable and splendid address here this afternoon on the whole subject of our public works development programs. My State has not shared in these programs, but in great degree we have shared in some development of the upper Mississippi. I deeply regret that I must return to my State with the full knowledge that in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill recognition of transmission lines was not granted us, that flood-survey funds were not granted us, and that funds for the caring of the Indian were not granted us.

Just as the Senator from South Carolina assured the Senate that he will be back here in January fighting for his project, so I can assure the Senate that, God willing, since there is no election in which I am directly involved, that I shall be back, greatly interested in the appropriations and authorizations of the Congress, to see to it that justice is done to the people of the State which in part I represent. I join with those who want to build our Nation into a greater Nation. Nothing could be worse than for the people to be divided so that there is a situation of section against section and State against State. Whatever is good for my friends in South Carolina is good for the people in Minnesota, and what is good for us is good for them.

Mr. President, we have a job to develop the resources of America. In recent days the President has called attention to the importance of saving to the American economy our minerals, our oil, and all the great substance with which God has blessed this Nation. That is something which alarms every Member of the Congress. Our job is to find new materials,

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes"; he is further

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 2 to the above-entitled bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2499)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment numbered 41 to the bill (H. R. 8370) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 41: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 41 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment to the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'Plant and equipment', including the purchase (not to exceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$2,898,800,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding twenty-five years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building or procurement of any machinery, equipment or materials therefor, nor any utility nor any portion or unit of a specific project if the funds are available to pay the cost

of such land, the cost of such building, machinery, equipment or materials, or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion or unit of such project."

And the House agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
B. R. MAYBANK,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$2,898,800,000 instead of \$1,450,000,000 as proposed by the House, and a total authorization of \$3,518,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees request the Atomic Energy Commission to make an investigation at a cost of not to exceed \$250,000 in connection with the proposed Hartwell project in South Carolina and Georgia with a view to determining its importance to the development of atomic energy plants in that area, and to submit such report at the next session of Congress.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report. Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter.)

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as a House conferee on both the supplemental appropriation bill, now under consideration, and the civil functions appropriation bill, I wish to make it completely clear, as a part of the legislative history of the appropriation for investigation by the Atomic Energy Commission, with respect to the Hartwell Dam on the Savannah River, that no part of such funds are to be used to initiate any construction on Hartwell Dam.

The importance of Hartwell Dam to the atomic-energy program seems to have been greatly exaggerated, and I am therefore happy that an investigation is to be made.

I include a letter to General Pick, Chief of Army Engineers, from M. W. Boyer, manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, which, in my opinion, is a lukewarm statement at most.

UNITED STATES,
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1952.
Lt. Gen. LEWIS A. PICK,
Chief of Engineers, Department of the
Army, National Military Establish-
ment.

DEAR GENERAL PICK: The Chamber of Commerce of Augusta, Ga., has requested that we advise you as to the interest of the Atomic Energy Commission in the proposed Hartwell Dam in Georgia. Mr. Kenney of your office has also inquired as to our interest in this project.

The Hartwell Dam will benefit the Savannah River project through the assurance of a uniform quantity of water supply and the reduction which we understand it will effect in the temperature of the water of the Savannah River which will be utilized at our Savannah River project. We also understand that it will contribute to the further reduction of flood hazards. Realization of these objectives will be of assistance to the operations at our Savannah River project. The lowering of the water temperature will give some measure of increased efficiency in the operation of reactors. The reduction of flood hazards will contribute to continuity of operations through avoidance of employee absenteeism resulting from real or potential flood threats.

Sincerely yours,

M. W. BOYER,
General Manager.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 240) providing for sine die adjournment July 5, 1952, with Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 3, strike out "Saturday, July 5, 1952" and insert "Monday, July 7, 1952."

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution providing for sine die adjournment July 7, 1952."

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the delegation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada the following members on the part of the House: Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Mr. CHIPERFIELD, and Mr. VORYS.

THE FARM PROGRAM

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the grand order of pessimists, the reactionary forces of the Republican Party, is meeting today in Chicago. It is a difficult task these delegates have taken. It will not be easy to put together the broken pieces of their party, or to breathe life into an organization that has been dead on its feet for 20 years. The clumsy elephant is in foul shape. In trying to resuscitate and revitalize his emaciated body, the delegates will blow a lot of hot air into his lungs. The writing of a Republican platform will indeed be a difficult task. The party has no record of which to be proud and nothing to point to with pride. Republican leadership is at an all-time low and in a state of utter confusion. The candidates have only confounded the issues. If we leave them alone, they will destroy themselves. The elephant, like Rip Van Winkle, has been sleeping for 20 years. I know he has had many nightmares, but I hope he has had some dreams.

While the Republican Party is just about 20 years behind the times, let us hope that they have been able to dream up something good, and that they will present a platform which will provide real issues for the campaign. In pre-convention speeches the big shots and so-called leaders of the Republican Party, in a desperate effort to woo farmers and win farm votes, have preferred false and fraudulent charges against officials of the administration in power—charges to the effect that for political purposes and immediately prior to the 1948 general election Government officials rigged the markets and manipulated prices to make it appear that prices were declining because the public was afraid of the threat of a Republican victory. These charges clearly indicate weakness and desperation. They are vicious, infamous, and obviously politically inspired. The mere thought, however, that the Republicans might win was, of course, enough to terrify the grain trade and all other groups in our economy. While the fear of Republican rule may have, in itself, actually caused the markets to decline, there were also during the period referred to market fluctuations which were normal because of powerful economic factors, as will be disclosed by a look at the record.

Even the great Governor Dewey should know, and certainly the other gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol, who have been sounding off so loudly about this matter, should know that a big crop means low prices to farmers, and that is exactly the situation we were faced with in the fall of 1948. If, in fact, an evil and unholy conspiracy actually existed, and the overt acts complained of were actually committed, why, let me ask you, have these complainants waited four long years, and just before another general election, to prefer their charges? Obviously, they are politically ambitious and are trying to mislead the public and to win the farm vote.

As strange as it may seem, just before the 1948 election, some of these same orators and so-called leaders were accusing the administration of trying to keep farm prices up and of being, there-

fore, responsible for the increased cost of living. This, too, was an insidious accusation. Actually, farm prices have very little to do with the cost of living, and frankly, the Department of Agriculture did everything it could to protect farm prices and to prevent farm prices from being demoralized and farm purchasing power destroyed. The Price Support Program for corn, for instance, was scheduled to go into effect December 1, 1948, but when the Secretary saw the big crop starting to move to market and knew it would depress the prices, he took the most effective action he could to protect farmers against the falling market. He moved the effective date of the support program to September 15.

The corn crop of 1947 was one of the smallest for many years prior thereto—2,384,000,000 bushels. It brought the highest corn prices on record. The corn crop of 1948 was an all-time record crop of 3,682,000,000 bushels. Naturally, the price came down as this tremendous crop was harvested and came to market. And there is no telling how low the price would have gone if it had not been for the Government's price support program of 90 percent of parity. That program stopped the decline at just below the support level—as it was designed to do. Under the Aiken flexible program that support level might have been at 75 percent of parity instead of 90 percent which would have been \$1.20 per bushel instead of \$1.44.

The following table shows the cash price of corn in the months prior to the election:

TABLE I.—Corn, No. 2 Yellow, daily cash prices at Chicago
(Cents per bushel)

Date	September 1948	October 1948	November 1948
1.....	210	160½	138¾
2.....	207	161½	(¹)
3.....	194	Sunday	140½
4.....	192½	162	142½
5.....	Sunday	163½	142¾
6.....	Holiday	166¾	141½
7.....	197	172½	Sunday
8.....	202¾	182	143
9.....	202-205	177	142½
10.....	200	Sunday	142¾
11.....	199½-200	171½	Holiday
12.....	Sunday	Holiday	142½
13.....	202	167½	140¾
14.....	199½	156	Sunday
15.....	195-196	158	141
16.....	184-190	157	142
17.....	183-185	Sunday	144
18.....	185	155	142
19.....	Sunday	156	141
20.....	179-181½	153	142½
21.....	184	153	Sunday
22.....	182½	151	144½
23.....	177¾	144½	146
24.....	177½	Sunday	145½
25.....	169	143	Holiday
26.....	Sunday	141¾	144
27.....	160½	144	143
28.....	164	141¾	Sunday
29.....	161	141	143¾
30.....	159¾	141	144
31.....		Sunday	

¹ Election day.

Source: Market News Records, Grain Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

If the 1948 drop in the price of corn was brought about by some evil and sinister action on the part of the officials of this administration, then it is clear that the speculators and traders who deal in grain futures were on the inside of that

deal and knew exactly what was going to happen. For these grain traders, probably the most expert judges in the Nation, predicted weeks in advance almost to the penny the price that corn would bring. The whole thing is preposterous and absurd and political.

It is interesting to note that the futures' traders have such good information about the administration plans that they bid the price of corn down to \$1.38 on August 27, 1948, more than 9 weeks before the cash grain hit that price.

It would be absurd, of course, to assume that the traders had any advance knowledge of the administration's tactics if the administration, indeed, had any tactics or schemes such as has been charged. Actually, as every reasonable person knows, they were merely reflecting their own judgment of the effect of the big corn crop of 1948 on corn prices, and they hit it right on the nose, as is shown by the following table:

TABLE II.—December 1948 corn futures—Closing Friday futures price

Dec. 26, 1947.....	1.93¼
Jan. 2, 1948.....	1.91½
Jan. 9, 1948.....	1.93¾
Jan. 16, 1948.....	1.95
Jan. 23, 1948.....	1.91¾
Jan. 30, 1948.....	1.87¼
Feb. 6, 1948.....	1.61
Feb. 13, 1948.....	1.54¾
Feb. 20, 1948.....	1.55¾
Feb. 27, 1948.....	1.63¾
Mar. 5, 1948.....	1.66½
Mar. 12, 1948.....	1.58¼
Mar. 19, 1948.....	1.62¾
Mar. 25, 1948.....	1.64¾
Apr. 2, 1948.....	1.65
Apr. 9, 1948.....	1.68¾
Apr. 16, 1948.....	1.72¾
Apr. 23, 1948.....	1.67¾
Apr. 30, 1948.....	1.68¾
May 7, 1948.....	1.69¼
May 14, 1948.....	1.71½
May 21, 1948.....	1.66¾
May 28, 1948.....	1.69¼
June 4, 1948.....	1.67¾
June 11, 1948.....	1.71½
June 18, 1948.....	1.68½
June 25, 1948.....	1.67½
July 2, 1948.....	1.66¾
July 9, 1948.....	1.62¾
July 16, 1948.....	1.61
July 23, 1948.....	1.57½
July 30, 1948.....	1.51¾
Aug. 6, 1948.....	1.48¾
Aug. 13, 1948.....	1.44½
Aug. 20, 1948.....	1.41½
Aug. 27, 1948.....	1.38½
Sept. 3, 1948.....	1.39¾
Sept. 10, 1948.....	1.40½
Sept. 17, 1948.....	1.41½
Sept. 24, 1948.....	1.40½
Oct. 1, 1948.....	1.37½
Oct. 8, 1948.....	1.42¾
Oct. 15, 1948.....	1.40
Oct. 22, 1948.....	1.39¾
Oct. 29, 1948.....	1.39½
Nov. 5, 1948.....	1.41½
Nov. 12, 1948.....	1.42½
Nov. 19, 1948.....	1.44
Nov. 26, 1948.....	1.44½
Dec. 3, 1948.....	1.44
Dec. 10, 1948.....	1.42¾
Dec. 17, 1948.....	1.43¾
Dec. 22, 1948.....	1.41¾

If you want the real reason why the price of corn fell from \$2.10 per bushel on September 1, 1948, to \$1.38 per bushel on the day before election, there are two very good reasons. First, there was a general but rather erroneous

Public Law 547 - 82d Congress
Chapter 758 - 2d Session
H. R. 8370

AN ACT

All 66 Stat. 637.

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953,
and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following Supplemental sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the Act, 1953. fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FISCAL SERVICE

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Salaries and expenses, Fiscal Service", \$70,000.

COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT FUND EXPENSES

DISTRICT GOVERNMENT RETIREMENT AND RELIEF FUNDS

For an additional amount for "District government retirement and relief funds", \$397,000.

DISTRICT DEBT SERVICE

For reimbursement to the Treasury of the United States for the amount paid to the Pan American Union under the provisions of Public Law 902, approved December 29, 1950, \$54,692. 64 Stat. 1133.

REGULATORY AGENCIES

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for "Office of Administrator of Rent Control", \$125,000, of which not less than \$27,000 shall be available for payment of terminal leave only: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation for the purposes of rent control in the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OPERATING EXPENSES

PUBLIC SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES FUND

For crediting to the public school food services fund, in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act (Public Law 159, approved October 8, 1951), \$25,000. 65 Stat. 367.

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil Defense, including personal services without reference to the civil service laws as related

50 Stat. 810. to recruitment; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$100,000.

REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

For payment of per diem for the fiscal year 1952 of members of the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia, \$5,020: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for the payment of such per diem for services rendered prior to July 1, 1950.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MEDICAL CHARITIES

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1950, for "Medical charities", \$92,613.

PUBLIC WORKS

OPERATING EXPENSES, ELECTRICAL DIVISION

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1951, for "Operating expenses, Electrical Division", \$19,341.

CAPITAL OUTLAY, SEWER DIVISION

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay, Sewer Division", to remain available until June 30, 1954, \$1,200,000, including such amount as may be necessary for the preparation of surveys, plans, and specifications in connection with the construction of storm-water and relief sewers.

REPAIRS TO OLD BAY LINE PIER

For emergency repairs to Old Bay Line pier, Washington Channel, \$26,700, which amount shall be transferred to the Department of the Army and be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until expended.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this Act for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years involved.

CHAPTER II

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Inaugural ceremonies.

Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1953: To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1953, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police, \$156,000.

Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery of \$300 for each Senator and the President of the Senate for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, \$29,100, to remain available for obligation until January 2, 1953.

For an additional amount for Inquiries and investigations, Committee on Appropriations, \$250,000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Committee on Appropriations Resolution Numbered 11, adopted by the committee on July 2, 1952, \$250,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

Stationery (revolving fund): For an additional amount for "Stationery (revolving fund)", \$132,200, including an additional stationery allowance of \$300 for each Representative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, to remain available until expended.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

For an additional amount for "House Office Buildings": \$48,750.

House Restaurants: For structural and mechanical changes, labor, materials, equipment, and all other necessary items to provide facilities for carry-out food service in the New and Old House Office Buildings, to be operated as part of the House of Representatives restaurants, \$23,000.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

CLAIMS, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport Act", 60 Stat. 170. \$585,536, as follows: Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia, \$51,797; 49 U.S.C. Municipal Airport, Hutchinson, Kansas, \$43,961; Salisbury-Wicomico Airport, Salisbury, Maryland, \$25,096; Holman Field, St. Paul, Minnesota, \$174,327; Municipal Airport, Dayton, Ohio, \$289,294; Kitsap County Airport, Kitsap, Washington, \$1,061. § 1101 note.

For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport Act", \$1,235,887, as follows: Municipal Airport, Tulsa, Oklahoma, \$111,106; Orange County Airport, Orange County, California, \$53,604; Bakersfield-Kern County Airport Number 1, Kern County (Bakersfield), California, \$45,719; Municipal Airport, Bainbridge, Georgia, \$54,196; Municipal Airport, Cleveland, Ohio, \$347,605; Municipal Airport, Beverly, Massachusetts, \$40,258; Municipal Airport, Orlando, Florida, \$246,618; Municipal Airport, Fort Wayne, Indiana, \$198,896; Municipal Airport, New Bedford, Massachusetts, \$30,580; Lambert-Saint Louis Municipal Airport, Saint Louis, Missouri, \$25,409; Municipal Airport, Grand Island, Nebraska, \$71,617; Cape May County Airport, Cape May County, New Jersey, \$10,279.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

EMERGENCY FACILITIES, RADIATION PHYSICS LABORATORY

For expenses necessary for construction of a Radium Laboratory and an annex to the Betatron Building, \$131,000.

CHAPTER IV

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", \$5,200,000.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction, and improvements", \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay", \$625,000.

RESERVE TRAINING

For an additional amount for "Reserve training", \$100,000.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$15,000,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be available during the current fiscal year for its administrative expenses, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and use of the services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks: *Provided*, That as used herein the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to include all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices: *Provided further*, That the limiting amount heretofore stated for administrative expenses shall be increased by an amount which does not exceed the aggregate cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside the continental United States; the expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with termination of contracts or in the performance of legal services; and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies: *Provided further*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Corporation shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount which may be expended for one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) carried under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby increased from "\$3,000" to "\$5,000".

Ante, p. 358.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION
AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration", \$6,800,000.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Salaries and expenses: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), including temporary employment of persons without regard to the civil service laws, \$2,800,000: *Provided*, That the general provisions applicable to the Department of Labor contained in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, shall apply to the funds appropriated herein in the same manner as if this appropriation were a part of that Act.

65 Stat. 119.
7 U.S.C.
§§ 1461-1468.
Ante, p. 372.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

For an additional amount for "Education of the Blind", \$60,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$60,000.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Payments to school districts", \$11,570,000.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "School construction", \$60,000,000 to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For additional amounts for increased costs of pay and allowances authorized by Public Law 346, approved May 19, 1952, as follows: Ante, p. 79.

"Communicable diseases", \$69,750;

"Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska", \$7,500;

"Hospitals and medical care", \$388,000;

"Foreign quarantine service", \$15,000;

"National Institutes of Health, operating expenses", \$48,750;

"Retired pay of commissioned officers", \$36,000;

"Salaries and expenses", \$20,250.

HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Hospitals and medical care" \$500,000; and this amount shall be exclusively available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Defense Community Facilities and Services", \$50,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Defense Community Facilities and Services, Federal Security Agency": *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this head shall be obligated after December 31, 1952, except for liquidation of the program.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For an additional amount for "Water conservation and utilization projects", \$190,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

Ante, p. 328. For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of Public Law 448, approved July 3, 1952, authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, \$125,000.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

65 Stat. 260. For an additional amount for "Construction", \$262,500, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That restrictions contained within the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952, limiting the amounts which may be expended from appropriations to the National Park Service for personal services, are hereby waived to the extent necessary to meet the costs of fire suppression and of emergency reconstruction or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Investigations of resources", \$240,000.

CHAPTER VIII

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

DEDICATION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIALS

For expenses necessary for an appropriate dedication of World War II memorials, erected under authority of the Act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 123), to be available for such purposes as the Commission may deem necessary and proper and without regard to the provisions of other laws or regulations relating to the expenditure of public funds (except that this exemption shall not be construed as waiving the requirement for the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit), \$30,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That, when in the discretion of the American Battle Monuments Commission it would be in the public interest, personnel and transportation facilities of any other Government agency may be furnished by such agency, without reimbursement, to the Commission for the purposes of this appropriation. 60 Stat. 317.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Operating expenses: For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", including the hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$88,094,000, of which \$50,000,000 shall be available only for the weapons program: *Provided*, That appropriations granted to the Commission under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available in amounts not to exceed \$27,909,900 for expenses of program direction and administration personnel, and not to exceed \$3,183,498 for expenses of travel.

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment", including the purchase (not to exceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$2,898,800,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding twenty-five years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed \$57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building or procurement of any machinery, equipment or materials therefor, nor any utility nor any portion or unit of a specific project if the funds 31 U.S.C. § 665. Contracts.

are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such building, machinery, equipment or materials, or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion or unit of such project.

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

Appropriations available to the "Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion", for fiscal year 1952, shall remain available until September 30, 1952.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Trade Commission", \$125,000.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Act approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended (65 Stat. 657), authorizing the establishment of a hospital center in the District of Columbia, including grants to private agencies for hospital facilities in said District, \$11,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the foregoing appropriation shall be the total amount to be provided by the Federal Government for the completion of the projects contemplated in connection with such appropriation: *Provided further*, That appropriations and contract authorizations heretofore granted under the head of "Hospital Center, District of Columbia" shall be merged with and accounted for as a part of this appropriation.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

DEFENSE HOUSING

For an additional amount for "Defense housing", including not to exceed \$1,433,735 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in connection with construction of housing under such appropriation, \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds hereby appropriated shall not be available in excess of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for defense housing by title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for the construction of any project unless funds are available for the completion of such project. No part of this appropriation may be used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long as that agency proceeds with any public-housing project after such project has been rejected or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing body has tendered the United States full reimbursement of Federal funds advanced on such project prior to such cancellation and a release from all obligations incurred under such project.

65 Stat. 303.
42 U.S.C.
§§ 1592—
1592o.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in title III of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, for administrative expenses of the Federal National Mortgage Association is increased by \$680,000; and the limitation under said head on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased by \$40,800: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall take effect only upon the enactment into law of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress. Ante, p. 415. Ante, p. 601.

ALASKA HOUSING

For an additional amount for "Alaska housing", \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall take effect only upon the enactment into law of S. 3066, Eighty-second Congress. Ante, p. 601.

SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

CAPITAL GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

For payment of capital grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1453, 1456), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended. 63 Stat. 413.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in title III of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration is increased by \$1,433,735; and the limitation under said head on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased by \$88,000. Ante, p. 417.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", \$187,500.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For an additional amount for "Tennessee Valley Authority", including the purchase of not to exceed an additional seventy passenger motor vehicles, \$150,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation on travel expenses in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby increased from \$1,546,650 to \$1,648,275. Ante, p. 407.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Administrative expenses", \$250,000, to be derived from the war claims fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948). 62 Stat. 1247. 50 U.S.C. app. § 2012.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MARITIME ACTIVITIES

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION LIQUIDATION

Ante. p. 414. The appropriation made available under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred against the working fund titled "Working fund, Commerce, War Shipping Administration functions, December 31, 1946".

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Military Public Works Appropriation Act, 1953.

TITLE I—MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FOREIGN COUNTRIES

For establishment and development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries, \$140,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

64 Stat. 1221. For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the Act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress), and the Act of —, 1952 (Public Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$5,000,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; \$585,510,000, to remain available until expended. Of total amount appropriated in this paragraph, \$1,980,000 shall be allocated for Camp Crowder, Missouri.

65 Stat. 336.
Ante, p. 606.
10 U.S.C.
§ 1339;
40 U.S.C.
§§ 259, 267.
31 U.S.C.
§ 723.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

PUBLIC WORKS

64 Stat. 236, 829, 1221. For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the Act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress), and the Act of —, 1952 (Public Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), seal coating for airfield pavements at Naval Station, Adak, Alaska; including not to exceed \$2,500,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; \$210,000 for the acquisition of facilities as authorized by said Act of September 11, 1950; furniture for public quarters; personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engineering and architectural services as authorized by section 3 of the Act of April

65 Stat. 336.
Ante, p. 606.
31 U.S.C.
§ 723.

25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556); \$361,254,840, to remain available until 53 Stat. 591. expended.

Naval Supply School, Athens, Georgia, rehabilitation of existing facilities and new construction, \$2,030,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the Act of March 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 17), the Act of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 936), as amended, the Act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress), the Act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress), and the Act of ———, 1952 (Public Law —, H. R. 8120, Eighty-second Congress), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; not to exceed \$52,620,000 for planning (including advance planning, master planning, and investigational engineering) as authorized by section 504 of said Act of September 28, 1951; and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,200,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be expended for actual construction of facilities or structures at Grandview Air Terminal, Missouri, until the city of Kansas City, Missouri, has conveyed to the United States Government the fee simple title to all lands required for the base or has given the United States Government at least a twenty-five-year lease to such land on a nominal rental basis.

64 Stat. 236,
1221.
65 Stat. 336.
Ante, p. 606.
10 U.S.C. §1339;
40 U.S.C.
§§259, 267.
33 U.S.C.
§733 and note.
31 U.S.C. §723.

SEC. 802. None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work where cost estimates exceed \$25,000 to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

Cost-plus-a-
fixed-fee con-
tract.

SEC. 803. None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be expended for additional costs involved in expediting construction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee for the purpose, shall establish a reasonable completion date for each project, taking into consideration the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal conditions affecting the construction and the application of economical construction practices. Any appropriation available to the Department of Defense shall be available for muster-out payments as authorized by law.

Costs of ex-
pediting pro-
duction.

SEC. 804. No part of the funds made available by this or any other Act of the present Congress shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery, laundry, or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons therefor, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates.

Bakery, laun-
dry facilities,
etc.

SEC. 805. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to expand the facilities of the Department of the Air Force to estab-

Separate
system of
supplies.

All 66 Stat. 648.

lish or maintain a separate system for providing such supplies and services as were furnished to the Department of the Air Force by the Department of the Army prior to August 1, 1951.

Citation
of title.

SEC. 806. This title may be cited as the "Military Public Works Appropriation Act, 1953".

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, at stations of the Alaska Communication System, as authorized by the Act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), and the Act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for construction of family quarters at (1) an average cost in excess of \$26,500 for construction, including but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of \$5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services therefor and all contingencies.

62 Stat. 375.
63 Stat. 934.
10 U.S.C.
§ 1339;
40 U.S.C.
§§ 259, 267.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Rivers and harbors: For an additional amount for "Rivers and harbors", including the objects specified under this head in the "Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953", \$5,000, to remain available until expended.

Ante, p. 580.

FLOOD CONTROL

Of the funds available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, not more than \$450,000 shall be available, until expended, for the planning, construction, and furnishing by the Corps of Engineers of adequate elementary and high-school facilities in the new combined municipality (commonly referred to as Newtown) in North Dakota, which is for the acquisition of and to replace the school facilities in the villages of Sanish and Van Hook, North Dakota, which are located within areas acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on said river, conditional upon Newtown School District Number 1, Mountrail County, North Dakota, wherein such new combined municipality is located, contributing to the cost of such planning, construction, and furnishing the maximum amount of money which can be provided through a bond issue within the general debt limitation permitted by law for such school district.

CHAPTER XI

MUTUAL SECURITY

Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1953.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government or occupation of certain foreign areas (except Germany, Japan and Austria), including, subject to such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition, travel expenses, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals not to exceed ten in number; translation rights, photographic work, education exhibits, and dissemination of information, including preview and review expenses incident thereto; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; not to exceed \$2,000 for contingencies for the United States commanders, commissioners, or other administrators of foreign areas, to be expended in their respective discretions; such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; \$11,000,000, of which not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the general provisions of the Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year for the military functions of the Department of the Army shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151–161): *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in such occupied areas in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and in the manner authorized by section 111 (b) (1) thereof: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of any area for which such funds are made available, may be expended by the President for the procurement of such commodities and technical services, and commodities procured from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the maintenance of the political and economic stability of such areas: *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made

60 Stat. 810.

Minimum supplies for civilian populations.

33 U.S.C. §733 and note; 10 U.S.C. §1339; 31 U.S.C. §529; 40 U.S.C. §§259, 267. 41 U.S.C. §5. 62 Stat. 21.

62 Stat. 137. 22 U.S.C. §1501 note. Commodities and technical services.

Bilateral agreement.

All 66 Stat. 650.

available, an agreement shall be entered into between the United States and the recognized government or authority with respect to such area containing such undertakings by such government or authority as the President may determine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided further*, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include requirements and undertakings corresponding to the requirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, approved December 17, 1947): *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay ocean transportation charges from United States ports, including territorial ports, to ports in the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such areas: *Provided further*, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals: *Provided further*, That the President may transfer to any other department or agency any function or functions provided for under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any such department or agency without reimbursement and without regard to the appropriation from which procured, such property as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,725,000 of the funds appropriated under this head for the fiscal year 1950, shall remain available until June 30, 1953, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed prior to July 1, 1950.

61 Stat. 934.
22 U.S.C.
§1411 note.
Payment of
certain
transporta-
tion charges.

Relief pack-
ages.

Transfer of
functions.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GOVERNMENT IN OCCUPIED AREAS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in Germany and Austria (including those arising under the supreme authority assumed by the United States on June 5, 1945, and under contractual arrangements with the Federal Republic of Germany), under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, including one deputy to the United States chief of mission in Germany at a salary of \$17,500; tuition, travel expenses, health and accident insurance, fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere, and hospitalization and medical care, including travel of attendants, of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; expenses for translation and reproduction rights; acquisition, maintenance, operation, and distribution of educa-

60 Stat. 810.
Tort claims.

62 Stat. 983.

tional, informational, reorientation, and rehabilitation materials and equipment for Germany and Austria, including grants; medical and health assistance for the civilian population of Germany and Austria; expenses incident to the operation of schools for American children who are dependents of Government personnel; expenses incident to maintaining discipline and order (including trial and punishment by courts established by or under authority of the President); printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices abroad; purchase (including one at not to exceed \$3,600 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation to Germany or Austria of property donated for the purposes of this appropriation; unforeseen contingencies (not to exceed \$25,000) for the United States chief of mission in Germany, to be accounted for pursuant to the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 107); and representation allowances (not to exceed \$35,000) similar to those authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131); \$19,000,000: 40 Stat. 1270.

Provided, That provisions of law, including current appropriation Acts, applicable to the Department of State shall be available for application to expenditures made from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That when section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932, as amended (31 U. S. C. 686), is employed to carry out the purposes of this appropriation the requisitioned agency may utilize the authority contained in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside the continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Department of State is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, including unforeseen contingencies, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation (1) currencies deposited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany and in Austria by the Republic of Austria in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and which may be made available by the Director for Mutual Security, (2) currencies otherwise deposited in Germany by the Federal Republic of Germany and which become available for use of the Government of the United States, its representatives or agencies in Germany, in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with the Director for Mutual Security, (3) other currencies derived from activities carried on under this appropriation, or in the possession of or under the control of the Department of State in Germany and Austria, and (4) in the event sufficient currencies are not available from the sources specified in (1), (2), and (3) above, currencies derived from payments by the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Austria to the Government of the United States for surplus property of whatever nature and kind heretofore made available to Germany and Austria, in an amount not to exceed the equivalent of \$25,000,000; however, the foregoing limitation shall not apply to currencies utilized hereunder for United States assistance to Berlin: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this appropriation appointments may be made to the Foreign Service Reserve without regard to the four-year limitation contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That in the event the President assigns to the Department of State responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government, occupation, or control of foreign areas in addition to Germany and 60 Stat. 1025.

33 U.S.C.
§ 733 and note;
31 U.S.C.
§ 529.

47 Stat. 417.

62 Stat. 150.
22 U.S.C.
§ 1513.

60 Stat. 1009.
22 U.S.C.
§ 922.

36 Stat. 1047. Austria, the authorities contained in this appropriation may be utilized by the Department of State in connection with such government, occupation, or control of such foreign areas: *Provided further*, That when the Department of the Army, under the authority of the Act of March 3, 1911, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1253), furnishes subsistence supplies to personnel of civilian agencies of the United States Government serving in Germany and Austria, payment therefor by such personnel shall be made at the same rate as is paid by civilian personnel of the Department of the Army serving in Germany and Austria, respectively.

TITLE III—MUTUAL SECURITY

65 Stat. 373. For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, approved October 10, 1951), as amended, as follows:

22 U.S.C. Military assistance, title I: For assistance authorized by section 101 § 1651 note. (a) (1), \$3,128,224,750; and, in addition, unexpended balances of 22 U.S.C. appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 101 (a) (1) of § 1681. said Act shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Economic and technical assistance, title I: For assistance authorized by section 101 (a) (2), \$1,282,433,000; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of said Act shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Ante, p. 141. Assistance to Spain: Unexpended balances of appropriations for "Assistance to Spain", granted in the Mutual Security Appropriation Act of 1952, shall remain available until June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with funds allocated for assistance to Spain pursuant to section 101 (c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended;

22 U.S.C. Military assistance, title II: For assistance authorized by section § 1691. 201, \$499,116,500; and in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 201 of said Act shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

22 U.S.C. Economic and technical assistance, title II: For assistance authorized § 1693. by section 203, \$50,822,750; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 203 of said Act (except the amounts allocated or available for the purposes of sections 204 and 205 of said Act) shall remain available through June 30, 1953, 22 U.S.C. and shall be consolidated with this appropriation; §§ 1694, 1695.

Ante, p. 142. Palestine refugee assistance, title II: For assistance authorized by section 206 for carrying out the purposes of section 204 of said Act, \$60,063,250; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made available pursuant to section 203 and allocated or otherwise available for the purposes of said section 204 shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Relief and resettlement of refugees entering Israel, title II: For assistance authorized by section 206 for carrying out the purposes of section 205 of said Act, \$70,228,000;

22 U.S.C. Military assistance, title III: For assistance authorized by section § 1701. 301, \$540,807,500; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 301 of said Act shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

22 U.S.C. Economic and technical assistance, title III: (a) For assistance § 1702. authorized by section 302 (a), to be furnished under the applicable

provisions of section 503 of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, \$202,-
778,250; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations
heretofore made available pursuant to section 302 of said Act and
allocated or otherwise available to the Mutual Security Agency (except
unexpended balances of funds allocated for assistance to Burma and
Indonesia) shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall
be consolidated with this appropriation; (b) For assistance author-
ized by section 302 (a) to be furnished under the applicable provisions
of the Act for International Development, as amended, \$67,793,000;
and, in addition, unexpended balances of (1) appropriations hereto-
fore available pursuant to section 302 of said Act and allocated or
otherwise available to the Technical Cooperation Administration,
and (2) funds allocated for assistance for Burma and Indonesia, shall
remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with
this appropriation;

Ante, p. 144.

22 U.S.C.
§ 1702.

64 Stat. 204.

22 U.S.C.
§ 1557 note.

Contributions to United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency,
title III: The unobligated balances of the appropriations available
during the fiscal year 1952 for carrying out section 303 of said Act shall
remain available through June 30, 1953;

Military assistance, Title IV: For assistance authorized by section
403 to carry out the provisions of section 401 of said Act, \$51,685,750;
and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore
made pursuant to said section 401 shall remain available through
June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

22 U.S.C.
§ 1711.

Ante, p. 143.

Technical assistance, title IV: For assistance authorized by sec-
tion 403 to carry out the provisions of section 402 of said Act,
\$20,329,000; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations
heretofore made pursuant to said section 402 shall remain available
through June 30, 1953, and be consolidated with this appropriation;

22 U.S.C.
§ 1712.

Movement of migrants, title V: For assistance authorized by sec-
tion 534, \$9,240,500;

Ocean freight, voluntary relief packages, title V: For assistance
authorized by section 535, \$2,587,500.

MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

For contributions authorized by section 404 (b) of the Act for
International Development, as amended by section 10 (a) of the
Mutual Security Act of 1952, \$9,171,333.

22 U.S.C.
§ 1557b.

Ante, p. 150.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

For contributions authorized by section 12 of the Mutual Security
Act of 1952, \$6,666,667.

Ante, p. 151.

CORPORATION

The following corporation is hereby authorized to make such ex-
penditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority avail-
able to such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year
limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corpora-
tion Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out
the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1953 for such
corporation:

59 Stat. 598.
31 U.S.C.
§ 849.

Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Availability of appropriations. Appropriations in this title for economic or technical assistance and allocations from any appropriations to the Director for Mutual Security, or the Mutual Security Agency, or the Department of State, shall be available, without limitation on any authority conferred by the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, or any Act continued in effect thereby, for rents in the District of Columbia; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of such appropriations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to exceed two aircraft for use outside the continental limits of the United States and maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft; purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the United States and, in addition, passenger motor vehicles abroad may be exchanged or sold and replaced for an equal number of such vehicles; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed \$20,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543); loss by exchange; expenditures (not to exceed \$50,000) of a confidential character other than entertainment provided that a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure, the nature of which it is considered inadvisable to specify, shall be made by the Director or Deputy Director of Mutual Security, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein specified; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; acquisition of quarters outside the continental limits of the United States to house employees of the United States Government by rental (without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, purchase, or construction, and necessary repairs and alterations to such quarters; health and accident insurance for foreign trainees and technicians while en route or absent from their own countries participating in activities authorized under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes in the United States or elsewhere the remains of persons or members of the families of persons who may die while such persons are away from their homes participating in activities under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended; and services of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for the purposes of providing such services the Public Health Service may appoint not to exceed 20 officers in the Regular Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance with section 711 of the Act of July 1, 1944, as amended (42 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey may appoint for such purposes not to exceed 20 commissioned officers in addition to those otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$37,800,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the departments and agencies concerned with the administration of the programs provided for herein, including not to exceed \$186,900 for personal services for those persons in a publicity office of the Mutual Security Agency in the District of Columbia the major part of whose activities is the dissemination of information in the United States and for expenses incident to the dissemination of such information, and no part of such amount shall be used to pay the salary of any civilian employee at a rate greater than that paid by the State Department for comparable work or services in the same area: *Provided further*, That no part of such funds shall be expended for the purchase of Agricultural products or products produced from Agricultural products not declared to be in short supply, in the United

65 Stat. 373.
22 U.S.C.
§ 1651 note.

Expenditures of confidential character.

47 Stat. 412.

Officers of PHS and Coast and Geodetic Survey.

62 Stat. 47.

Administrative expenses.

Agricultural products.

States by the Secretary of Agriculture, at less than the prevailing market price for such commodity within the United States or if obtained from the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, at less than the support price of such commodity including handling and storage costs, but nothing in this proviso shall be construed to prevent the operation of export payment programs, other than those financed from funds contained in this chapter, pursuant to section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended, or to prevent the sale at less than the support price, including handling and storage costs, of any commodity from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks which has substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage.

49 Stat. 774.
7 U.S.C.
§ 612c.

This chapter may be cited as the "Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1953".

Citation of
chapter.

CHAPTER XII

EMERGENCY AGENCIES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

For expenses necessary for the Office of Defense Mobilization, including compensation of the Director of Defense Mobilization; printing and binding without regard to section 89 of the Act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U. S. C. 213); hire of passenger motor vehicles; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; \$1,250,000: *Provided*, That contracts under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), may be renewed annually.

28 Stat. 622.

60 Stat. 810.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for the Defense Production Administration, including employment of aliens, reimbursement of General Services Administration for security guard services, and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$2,875,000: *Provided*, That transfers (not to exceed 10 per centum) between the appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Defense Production Administration" and "Salaries and expenses, Defense Production Activities, Department of Commerce" may be made by agreement between the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Defense Production Administration with approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Transfers
of funds.

DEFENSE TRANSPORT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Defense Transport Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$2,200,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for not to exceed four contracts for temporary

All 66 Stat. 656.

60 Stat. 810. or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) which may be renewed annually.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Small Defense Plants Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, and purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$3,750,000.

REVOLVING FUND

For the revolving fund authorized by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, 65 Stat. 139. \$1,500,000.
50 U.S.C. app. § 2163a.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Federal Security Agency to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, 64 Stat. 798. § 2061. \$400,000.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Agriculture to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; and reimbursement of General Services Administration for security guard services; \$28,750,000. 64 Stat. 798. § 2061.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Commerce to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; and reimbursement of General Services Administration for security guard services; \$28,750,000. 64 Stat. 798. § 2061.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of the Interior to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; \$3,100,000. 64 Stat. 798. § 2061.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Justice to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, \$90,000. 64 Stat. 798.
50 U.S.C.app.
§ 2061.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Labor to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purpose of this appropriation, \$1,875,000. 64 Stat. 798.
50 U.S.C.app.
§ 2061.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Economic Stabilization Agency, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Administrator for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; including expenses of liquidation of those agencies whose operations and functions will expire prior to June 30, 1953, \$60,000,000: *Provided*, That of this amount \$11,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Rent Stabilization of which \$2,000,000 shall be placed in reserve under the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to be released by the Director of the Budget only on his determination that the workload of the agency so requires: *Provided further*, That subparagraph (B) of section 204 (f) (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows: Meetings.
Liquidation expenses.
31 U.S.C.
§ 665.
Rent control.
64 Stat. 255.
50 U.S.C.app.
§ 1894.

“(B) In any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, village, or unincorporated area; and”

(2) of section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) Any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which makes the declaration specified in paragraph (1) (b) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken.”

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Emergency operating expenses", \$6,500,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available only to enable the General Services Administration to carry out its functions arising out of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Stat. 798.
U.S.C. app.
2061.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Congress), including purchase (not to exceed eight) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of employees occupying positions of critical importance from the standpoint of national security; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; not to exceed \$9,000 for the purchase of newspapers, periodicals, and teletype news services; and not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Administrator for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$8,000,000.

Stat. 1245.
U.S.C. app.
2251 note.
Stat. 810.

etings.
curity
ard serv-
es.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For financial contributions to the States, not otherwise provided for, pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, to be equally matched with State funds, \$15,000,000.

U.S.C. app.
2281.

EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

For procurement of reserve stocks of emergency civil defense materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, \$20,000,000.

U.S.C. app.
2281.

PROCUREMENT FUND

The "Civil Defense Procurement Fund" is continued available without fiscal year limitation.

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in House Document Numbered 517, and Senate Documents Numbered 144, 154 and 157, Eighty-second Congress, \$6,743,026, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates

of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

CHAPTER XIV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

SEC. 1401. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), is hereby fixed at \$1,400, notwithstanding the provisions of section 405 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953.

Motor
vehicles.
60 Stat. 810.

SEC. 1402. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, that any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort.

Ante, p. 419.
Citizenship
requirements
for employ-
ment.

Affidavit.

Penalty.

Recoupment.

Nonapplicabil-
ity.

SEC. 1403. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for living quarters allowances in accordance with the Act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), and regulations prescribed thereunder, and cost-of-living allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, in accordance with and to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, for all civilian officers and employees of the Government permanently stationed in foreign countries: *Provided*, That the availability of appropriations made to the Department of State for carrying out the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall not be affected hereby.

Living quar-
ters allow-
ances.

46 Stat. 818.

60 Stat. 1026.

22 U.S.C.

§ 1131.

22 U.S.C.

§ 801 note.

SEC. 1404. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person.

Senate dis-
approval of
nomination.

U.S. Code
Annotated,
Lifetime
Federal Di-
gest.

SEC. 1405. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay in excess of \$4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of \$4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest.

Funds for
administra-
tive expen-
ses.
59 Stat. 597.

SEC. 1406. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; examination of budgets and estimates of appropriations in the field; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

60 Stat. 810.

Use of funds
for construc-
tion, etc.

SEC. 1407. No part of any funds of or available to any wholly owned Government corporation shall be used for the purchase or construction, or in making loans for the purchase or construction of any office building at the seat of Government primarily for occupancy by any department or agency of the United States Government or by any corporation owned by the United States Government.

Strikes or
overthrow of
Government.

SEC. 1408. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both:

Affidavit.

Penalty.

Provided further, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 1409. No payment shall be made from appropriations in this Act or any other to any officer on the retired lists of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Marine Corps, Regular Air Force, Regular Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service for a period of two years after retirement who for himself or for others is engaged in the selling of or contracting for the sale of or negotiating for the sale of to any agency of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service any supplies or war materials.

Retired officers.

SEC. 1410. Appropriations and funds made available by this or any other Act for salaries, wages, or compensation shall also be available for payment of any tax with respect thereto which is imposed on any department, agency, corporation, or other instrumentality of the United States, as an employer, by the provisions of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950.

Social Security payments.

SEC. 1411. During the current fiscal year, personnel and appropriations or funds available for salaries and expenses to any department, agency, or corporation in the executive branch of the Government, shall be transferred to any defense activity under the jurisdiction of such department or agency in such numbers or amounts as may be necessary for the discharge of responsibilities relating to the national defense assigned to such department, agency, or corporation by or pursuant to law.

64 Stat. 477.
42 U.S.C.
§ 301 note.
Defense activities.

SEC. 1412. None of the funds provided by this Act shall be used to pay employees at a rate in excess of that paid for comparable work under the regular appropriations provided to the departments and agencies concerned in the regular 1953 appropriation Acts.

Payment of employees.

SEC. 1413. During the current fiscal year, the provisions of Bureau of the Budget Circular A-45, dated June 3, 1952, shall be controlling over the activities of all departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government: *Provided*, That said circular may be amended or changed during such year by the Director of the Budget with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of the Budget shall make a report to Congress not later than January 31, 1953, of the operations of this order upon all departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law no officer or employee shall be required to occupy any Government-owned quarters unless the head of the agency concerned shall determine that necessary service cannot be rendered or property of the United States cannot be adequately protected otherwise.

Budget control.

Report to Congress.

Government-owned quarters.

SEC. 1414. The appropriations, authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this Act or any regular annual appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 which has not been enacted into law prior to July 1, 1952, shall be available from and including such date for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations, authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1952, and the date of enactment of this Act or the applicable Act in anticipation of such appropriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the respective terms thereof.

Availability of appropriations, etc.

Foreign cre-
dits.

SEC. 1415. Foreign credits owed to or owned by the United States Treasury will not be available for expenditure by agencies of the United States after June 30, 1953, except as may be provided for annually in appropriation Acts and provisions for the utilization of such credits for purposes authorized by law are hereby authorized to be included in general appropriation Acts.

Short title.

SEC. 1416. This Act may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953".

Approved July 15, 1952.

3540 E